

A SECOND
VINDICATION
OF THE
REASONABLENESS
OF
CHRISTIANITY,
As deliver'd in the
SCRIPTURES.

By JOHN LOCKE, *Esq;*

The FIFTH EDITION.



L O N D O N:

Printed for A. BETTESWORTH and C. HITCH,
in *Pater-noster Row*; J. PEMBERTON, a-
gainst *St. Dunstan's Church* in *Fleet-street*; and
E. SYMON, in *Cornhill*. 1736.

THE
LIBRARY
OF THE
MUSEUM
OF
COMPARATIVE ZOOLOGY
AND ANATOMY
OF THE
MUSEUM OF
COMPARATIVE ZOOLOGY
AND ANATOMY
OF THE
MUSEUM OF
COMPARATIVE ZOOLOGY
AND ANATOMY



P R E F A C E

T O T H E

R E A D E R.

I*T hath pleased Mr. Edwards, in answer to The Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. and its Vindication, to turn one of the most weighty and important Points that can come into Question (even no less than the very Fundamentals of the Christian Religion) into a meer Quarrel against the Author; as every one, with Mr. Bold, may observe. In my Reply to him, I have endeavour'd, as much as his Objections would allow me, to bring him to the Subject Matter of my Book, and the Merits of the Cause; though his peculiar Way of*

writing Controversy has made it necessary for me, in following him step by step, to wipe off the Dirt he has thrown on me, and clear my self from those Falshoods he has filled his Book with. This I could not but do, in dealing with such an Antagonist; that by the Untruths I have proved upon him, the Reader may judge of those other Allegations of his, whereof the Proof lying on his side, the bare Denial is enough on mine, and indeed are wholly nothing to the Truth or Falshood of what is contained in my Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. To which I shall desire the Reader to add this farther Consideration from his way of Writing, not against my Book, but against me for writing it, that if he had had a real Concern for Truth and Religion in this Dispute, he would have treated it after another Manner; and we should have had from him more Argument, Reasoning and Clearness, and less Boasting, Declamation and Railing. It has been unavoidable for me to take Notice of a great deal of this Sort of Stuff, in answering a Writer who has very little else to say in the Controversy, and places his Strength in Things beside the Question: But yet I have been so careful to take all Occasions to explain the Doctrine of my Book, that I hope the Reader will not think his Pains wholly lost Labour in perusing this
Reply,

Reply, wherein he will find some farther, and, I hope, satisfying Account concerning the Writings of the New Testament, and the Christian Religion contained in it.

Mr. Edwards's ill Language, which I thought personally to me (though I know not how I had provoked a Man whom I had never had to do with) I am now satisfied by his rude and scurrilous treating of Mr. Bold, is his Way and Strength in Management of Controversy; and therefore requires a little more Consideration in this Disputant, than otherwise it would deserve. Mr. Bold, with the Calmness of a Christian, the Gravity of a Divine, the Clearness of a Man of Parts, and the Civility of a well-bred Man, made some Animadversions on his Socinianism unmask'd; which, with a Sermon preach'd on the same Subject with my Reasonableness of Christianity, he Publish'd: And how he has been used by Mr. Edwards, let the World judge.

I was extremely surprized with Mr. Bold's Book, at a Time when there was so great an Outcry against mine on all Hands. But, it seems, he is a Man that does not take up Things upon Hearsay; nor is afraid to own Truth, whatever Clamour or Calumny it may lie under. Mr. Edwards confidently tells the World, that Mr. Bold has been drawn in to espouse this Cause,

vi *The Preface to the Reader.*

upon base and mean Considerations. Whose Picture of the two, such a Description is most likely to give us, I shall leave to the Reader to judge, from what he will find in their Writings on this Subject. For, as to the Persons themselves, I am equally a Stranger to them both: I know not the Face of either of them: And having hitherto never had any Communication with Mr. Bold, I shall begin with him, as I did with Mr. Edwards, in Print; and here publicly return him this following Acknowledgment for what he has printed in this Controversy.

To Mr. B O L D.

S I R,

THough I do not think I ought to return Thanks to any one for being of my Opinion, any more than to fall out with him for differing from me; yet I cannot but own to all the World, the Esteem that I think is due to you, for that Proof you have given of a Mind and Temper becoming a true Minister of the Gospel, in appearing, as you have done, in the Defence of a Point, a great Point of Christianity, which it is evident you could
have

have no other Temptation to declare for, but the Love of Truth. It has fared with you herein no better than with me. For *Mr. Edwards*, not being able to answer your Arguments, has found out already that you are a *Mercenary*, defending a Cause against your *Persuasion* for Hire; and that you *are sailing to Racovia by a side Wind*: Such Inconsistencies can one (whose Business it is to rail for a Cause he cannot defend) put together to make a Noise with: And he tells you plainly what you must expect, if you write any more on this Argument, *viz.* to be pronounced a down-right *Apostate* and *Renegado*.

As soon as I saw your *Sermon* and *Animadversions*, I wonder'd what Scare-Crow *Mr. Edwards* would set up, wherewith he might hope to deter Men of more Caution than Sense from reading of them: Since *Socinianism*, from which you were known to be as remote as he, I concluded would not do. The unknown Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, he might make a *Socinian*, *Mahometan*, *Atheist*, or what Sort of *Raw-head* and *Bloody-bones* he pleased. But I imagined he had had more Sense than to venture any such Aspersions on a Man whom, though I have not yet the Happiness personally

viii *The Preface to the Reader.*

to know ; yet I know hath justly a great and settled Reputation amongst worthy Men : And I thought that that Coat which you had worn with so much Reputation, might have preserved you from the Bespatterings of Mr. *Edwards's* Dunghill. But what is to be expected from a Warrior that hath no other Ammunition, and yet ascribes to himself Victory from hence, and, with this Artillery, imagines he carries all before him ? And so *Skimmington* rides in Triumph, driving all before him by the Ordures that he bestows on those that come in his Way. And were not Christianity concerned in the Case, a Man would scarce excuse to himself the Ridiculousness of entring into the List with such a Combatant. I do not therefore wonder that this mighty Boaster, having no other Way to answer the Books of his Opponents, but by popular Calumnies, is fain to have Recourse to his only Refuge, and lay out his natural Talent in vilifying and slandering the Authors. But I see, by what you have already writ, how much you are above that ; and as you take not up your Opinions from Fashion or Interest, so you quit them not to avoid the malicious Reports of those that do : Out of which Number they can hardly be left, who (unprovoked) mix with
the

the Management of their Cause, Injuries and ill Language to those they differ from. This, at least I am sure, Zeal or Love for Truth, can never permit Falshood to be used in the Defence of it.

Your Mind I see prepared for Truth, by Resignation of it self not to the Traditions of Men, but the Doctrine of the Gospel, has made you more readily entertain, and more easily enter into the Meaning of my Book, than most I have heard speak of it. And since you seem to me to comprehend what I have laid together, with the same Disposition of Mind, and in the same Sense that I received it, from the Holy Scriptures, I shall, as a Mark of my Respect to you, give you a particular Account of the Occasion of it.

The Beginning of the Year in which it was publish'd, the Controversy that made so much Noise and Heat amongst some of the Dissenters, coming one Day accidentally into my Mind, drew me, by Degrees, into a stricter and more thorough Enquiry into the Question about Justification. The Scripture was direct and plain; and 'twas Faith that justified: The next Question then was, What Faith that was that justified; what it was, which, if a Man believed, it should be imputed to him for Righteousness? To find out this,
I

I thought the right Way was, to search the Scriptures ; and thereupon betook my self seriously to the reading of the *New Testament*, only to that Purpose. What that produced, you and the World have seen.

The first View I had of it, seem'd mightily to satisfy my Mind, in the Reasonableness and Plainness of this Doctrine ; but yet the general Silence I had in my little reading met with, concerning any such Thing, awed me with the Apprehension of Singularity ; till going on in the Gospel History, the whole Tenor of it made so clear and visible, that I more wonder'd that every Body did not see and embrace it ; than that I should assent to what was so plainly laid down, and so frequently inculcated in holy Writ, though Systems of Divinity said nothing of it. That which added to my Satisfaction, was, that it led me into a Discovery of the marvelous and divine Wisdom of our Saviour's Conduct, in all the Circumstances of his Promulgating this Doctrine ; as well as of the Necessity that such a Law-giver should be sent from God for the reforming the Morality of the World ; two Points that, I must confess, I had not found so fully and advantageously explained in the Books of Divinity I had met with,

with, as the History of the Gospel seem'd to me, upon an attentive Perusal, to give Occasion and Matter for. But the Necessity and Wisdom of our Saviour's opening the Doctrine (which he came to publish) as he did in Parables, and figurative Ways of speaking, carries such a Thread of Evidence through the whole History of the Evangelists, as I think is impossible to be resisted; and makes it a Demonstration, that the Sacred Historians did not write by Concert as Advocates, for a bad Cause, or to give Colour and Credit to an Imposture they would usher into the World; since they, every one of them, in some Place or other, omit some Passages of our Saviour's Life, or Circumstances of his Actions; which shew the Wisdom and Wariness of his Conduct; and which even those of the Evangelists, who have recorded, do barely and transiently mention, without laying any Stress on them, and making the least Remark of what Consequence they are to give us our Saviour's true Character, and to prove the Truth of their History. These are Evidences of Truth and Sincerity, which result alone from the Nature of Things, and cannot be produced by any Art or Contrivance.

How much I was pleas'd with the growing Discovery, every Day, whilst I was em-

employed in this Search, I need not say. The wonderful Harmony, that the farther I went, disclosed it self, tending to the same Points, in all the Parts of the sacred History of the Gospel, was of no small Weight with me and another Person who every Day, from the Beginning to the End of my Search, saw the Progress of it, and knew at my first setting out that I was ignorant whither it would lead me ; and therefore, every Day, asked me, What more the Scripture had taught me? So far was I from the Thoughts of *Socinianism*, or an Intention to write for that or any other Party, or to publish any thing at all. But when I had gone through the Whole, and saw what a plain, simple, reasonable Thing Christianity was, suited to all Conditions and Capacities ; and in the Morality of it now, with divine Authority, established into a legible Law, so far surpassing all that Philosophy and human Reason had attained to, or could possibly make effectual to all Degrees of Mankind ; I was flatter'd to think it might be of some Use in the World ; especially to those who thought either that there was no need of Revelation at all, or that the Revelation of our Saviour required the Belief of such Articles for Salvation, which the settled Notions and their way of Reasoning

soning in some, and want of Understanding in others, made impossible to them. Upon these two Topicks the Objections seemed to turn, which were, with most Assurance, made by *Deists* against *Christianity*; but against *Christianity* misunderstood. It seem'd to me, that there needed no more to shew them the Weakness of their Exceptions, but to lay plainly before them the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, as delivered in the Scriptures, and not as taught by the several Sects of Christianity.

This tempted me to publish it, not thinking it deserved an Opposition from any Minister of the Gospel; and least of all, from any one in the Communion of the Church of *England*. But so it is, that Mr. *Edwards's* Zeal for he knows not what (for he does not yet know his own Creed, nor what is required to make him a Christian) could not brook so plain, simple, and intelligible a Religion: But yet not knowing what to say against it, and the Evidence it has from the Word of God, he thought fit to let the Book alone, and fall upon the Author. What great Matter he has done in it I need not tell you, who have seen and shewed the Weakness of his Wranglings. You have here, Sir, the true History of the Birth of my *Reasonableness*

xiv *The Preface to the Reader.*

ableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scriptures, and my Design in publishing it, &c. What it contains, and how much it tends to Peace and Union among Christians, if they would receive Christianity as it is, you have discovered.

I am, S I R,

Your most humble Servant,

A. B.

My Readers will pardon me, that in my Preface to them, I make this particular Address to Mr. Bold. He hath thought it worth his while to defend my Book. How well he has done it, I am too much a Party to say: I think it so sufficient to Mr. Edwards, that I needed not have troubled my self any farther about him, on the Account of any Argument that remains in his Book to be answered. But a great Part of the World judging of Contests about Truth, as they do of popular Elections, that the Side carries it where the greatest Noise is; 'twas necessary they should be undeceived, and be let see, that sometimes such Writers may be let alone, not because they cannot, but because they deserve not to be answer'd.

This

The Preface to the Reader. **xv**

This farther I ought to acknowledge to Mr. Bold, and own to the World, that he hath entered into the true Sense of my Treatise; and his Notions do so perfectly agree with mine, that I shall not be afraid, by Thoughts and Expressions very like his, in this my Second Vindication, to give Mr. Edwards (who is exceedingly quick-sighted, and positive in such Matters) a handle to tell the World, that either I borrowed this my Vindication from Mr. Bold, or writ his Animadversions for him. The former of these I shall count no Discredit, if Mr. Edwards thinks fit to charge me with it; and the latter Mr. Bold's Character is Answer enough to. Though the impartial Reader, I doubt not, will find that the same uniform Truth consider'd by us, suggested the same Thoughts to us both, without any other Communication.

*There is another Author, who, in a civiler Stile, hath made it necessary for me to vindicate my Book from a Reflection or two of his, wherein he seems to come short of that Candor he professes. All that I shall say on this Occasion here, is, that it is a Wonder to me, that having published what I thought the Scripture told me was the Faith that made a Christian, and desired that if I was mistaken, any one that thought so would have the Goodness to inform me better; so many
with*

xvi *The Preface to the Reader.*

with their Tongues, and some in Print, should intemperately find fault with a poor Man out of his Way, who desires to be set right; and no one who blames his Faith, as coming short, will tell him what that Faith is, which is required to make him a Christian. But I hope, that amongst so many Censures, I shall at last find one, who knowing himself to be a Christian upon other Grounds than I am, will have so much Christian Charity, as to shew me what more is absolutely necessary to be believed by me, and every Man, to make him a Christian.





A SECOND
VINDICATION
OF THE
REASONABLENESS
OF
CHRISTIANITY, &c.



Cause that stands in need of
Falshoods to support it, and
an Adversary that will make
use of them, deserve no-
thing but Contempt; which
I doubt not but every con-
siderate Reader thought Answer enough
to Mr. *Edwards's Socinianism Unmask'd*.
But since in his late *Socinian Creed*, he says,
I would have answer'd him if I could, That
the Interest of Christianity may not suffer
by my Silence, nor the Contemptibleness
of his Treatise afford him Matter of Tri-
umph

umph amongst those who lay any Weight on such Boasting, 'tis fit it should be shewn what an Arguer he is, and how well he deserves for his Performance to be dubbed by himself *Irrefragable*.

Those who, like Mr. *Edwards*, dare to publish Inventions of their own for Matters of Fact, deserve a Name so abhorred, that it finds not Room in civil Conversation. This secures him from the proper Answer due to his Imputations to me in point of Matters of Fact utterly false, which, without any Reply of mine, fix upon him that Name (which, without a profligate Mind, a Man cannot expose himself to) till he hath proved them. Till then, he must wear what he has put upon himself. This being a Rule which common Justice hath prescribed to the private Judgments of Mankind, as well as to the publick Judicatures of Courts, That all Allegations of Fact brought by contending Parties should be presum'd to be false till they are proved.

There are two Ways of making a Book unanswerable. The one is by the Clearness, Strength and Fairness of the Argumentation. Men who know how to write thus, are above bragging what they have done, or boasting to the World that their Adversaries are *baffled*. Another Way to make a Book unanswerable, is to lay Stress on

on Matters of Fact foreign to the Question, as well as to Truth; and to stuff it with Scurrility and Fiction. This hath been always so evident to common Sense, that no Man who had any Regard to Truth or Ingenuity, ever thought Matters of Fact besides the Argument, and Stories made at Pleasure, the Way of managing Controversies. Which shewing only the Want of Sense and Argument, could, if used on both Sides, end in nothing but down-right Railing: And he must always have the Better of the Cause, who has Lying and Impudence on his Side.

The *Unmasker*, in the Entrance of his Book, sets a great Distance between his and my Way of Writing. I am not sorry that mine differs so much as it does from his. If it were like his, I should think, like his, it wanted the Author's Commendations. For, in his first Paragraph, which is all laid out in his own Testimony of his own Book, he so earnestly bespeaks an Opinion of Mastery in Politeness, Order, Coherence, Pertinence, Strength, Seriousness, Temper, and all the good Qualities requisite in Controversy, that, I think, since he pleases himself so much with his own good Opinion, one in pity ought not to go about to rob him of so considerable an Admirer. I shall not therefore contest any of those Excellen-

cies he ascribes to himself, or Faults he blames in me in the Management of the Dispute between us, any farther than as particular Passages of his Book, as I come to examine them, shall suggest unavoidable Remarks to me. I think the World does not so much concern it self about him or me, that it need be told, in that Inventory he has given of his own good Parts in his first Paragraph, which of us two has the better Hand at *Flourishes, Jesting, and common Places*; if I am, as he says, *p. 2. troubled with angry Fits, and passionate Ferments, which, though I strive to palliate, are easily discernable, &c.* and he be more laudably ingenuous in the Openness of that Temper, which he shews in every Leaf, I shall leave to him the entire Glory of boasting of it. Whatever we brag of our Performances, they will be just as they are, however he may think to add to his by his own Encomiums of them. The Difference in Stile, Order, Coherence, good Breeding (for all those amongst others the *Unmasker* mentions) the Reader will observe, whatever I say of them; and at best, they are nothing to the Question in hand. For, though I am a *Tool, Pert, Childish, Starck'd, Impertinent, Incoherent, Trifling, Weak, Passionate, &c.* Commendations I meet with before I get to the 4th Page; besides what follows, as *Upstart*

Racovian, p. 24. *Flourishing Scribler*, p. 41. *Diffembler*, p. 106. *Pedantick*, p. 107. I say, although I am all this, and what else he liberally bestows on me in the rest of his Book, I may have Truth on my Side, and that in the present Case serves my Turn.

Having thus placed the Laurels upon his own Head, and sung Applause to his own Performance, he, *p. 4.* enters, as he thinks, upon his Business, which ought to be, as he confesses, *p. 3.* *to make good his former Charges.* The first whereof he sets down in these Words. That *I unwarrantably crouded all the necessary Articles of Faith into one, with a Design of favouring Socinianism.*

If it may be permitted to the subdued to be so bold with one, who is already Conqueror, I desire to know where that Proposition is laid down in these Terms as laid to my Charge. Whether it be true, or false, shall, if he pleases, be hereafter examined: But it is not at present the Matter in Question. There are certain Propositions, which he having affirmed, and I denied, are under Debate between us: And that the Dispute may not run into an endless Ramble, by multiplying of new before the Points in Contest are decided, those ought first to be brought to an Issue,

6 *A Second Vindication of the*

To go on therefore in the Order of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, (for p. 3. he has, out of the *Mishna*, taught me good Breeding, *to answer the First first, and so in Order*) the next Thing he has against me, is p. 5. which, that the Reader may understand the Force of, I must inform him, that in p. 105. of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, he said, that I give this plausible Conceit, as he calls it, over and over again, in these formal Words, viz. "That nothing is required to be believed by any Christian Man but this, That Jesus is the Messiah." This I denied. To make it good, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 5. he thus argues, First, *It is observable, that this guilty Man would be shifting off the Indictment, by excepting against the Formality of Words, as if such were not to be found in his Book: But when doth he do this? In the Close of it, when his Matter was exhausted, and he had nothing else to say, Vind. p. 291. then he betinks himself of this Salvo, &c. Answ.* As if a Falshood were ever the less a Falshood, because it was not opposed, or would grow into a Truth if it were not taken Notice of, before the 38th Page of the Answer. I desire him to shew me these formal Words over and over again, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*: Nor let him hope to evade by saying, I would be shifting, by excepting against the Formality of the Words.

To

To say that *I have, over and over again, those formal Words* in my Book, is an Assertion of a Matter of Fact; let him produce the Words, and justify his Allegation, or confess, that this is an Untruth published to the World: And since he makes so bold with Truth in a Matter visible to every Body, let the World be Judge, what Credit is to be given to his Allegations of Matters of Fact, in Things foreign to what I have printed; and that are not capable of a Negative Proof. A Sample whereof the Reader has, at the Entrance in his *Introduction*; Page A 4. and the three or four following Pages: Where he affirms to the World, not only what I know to be false, but what every one must see, he could not know to be true. For he pretends to know and deliver my Thoughts. And what the Character is of one that confidently affirms what he does not know, no Body need be told.

But he adds, *I had before pleaded to the Indictment, and thereby owned it to be true.* This is to make good his Promise, p. 3. to keep at a Distance from *my feeble Strugglings*. Here this strong Arguer must prove, that what is not answer'd or deny'd in the very Beginning of a Reply, or before the 3^dth Page, is *owned to be true*. In the mean Time, till he does that, I shall desire such of my Readers as think the Un-

masker's Veracity worth examining, to see in my *Vindication*, from p. 282—285. wherein is contain'd, what I have said about *one Article*, whether I have own'd what he charged me with, on that Subject.

This Proposition then remains upon him still to be proved, *viz.*

- I. *That I have, over and over again, these formal Words in my Reasonableness of Christianity, viz. That nothing is required to be believed by any Christian Man, but this, That Jesus is the Messiah.*

He goes on, p. 5. *And indeed he could do no other; for it was the main Work he set himself about to find but one Article of Faith in all the Chapters of the four Evangelists, and the Acts of the Apostles. This is to make good his Promise, p. 3. To clear his Book from those sorry Objections and Cavils I had raised against it. Several of my sorry Objections and Cavils were to represent to the Reader, that a great Part of what he said, was nothing but Suspicions and Conjectures, and such he could not but then own them to be. But now he has rid himself of all his Conjectures, and has raised them up into direct positive Affirmations, which being said with Confidence without*

out Proof, who can deny, but he has clear'd, thoroughly clear'd that Part from my *sorry Objections and Cavils*? He says, *It was the main Work I set my self about to find but one Article of Faith.* This I must take the Liberty to deny: And I desire him to prove it. A Man may *set himself to find two*, or as many as there be, and yet find but one: Or a Man may *set himself to find but one*, and yet find two or more. It is no Argument from what a Man has found, to prove what was his *main Work* to find, unless where his Aim was only to find what there was, whether more or less. For a Writer may find the Reputation of a poor contemptible Railer; nay, of a downright impudent Lyar, and yet no Body will think it was his main Work to find that. Therefore, Sir, if you will not find what 'tis like you did not seek, you must prove those many confident Assertions you have publish'd, which I shall give you in tale, whereof this is the Second, *viz.*

II. That *the main Business I set my self about, was to find but one Article of Faith.*

In the following Part of this Sentence, he quotes my own Words, with the Pages where they are to be found; the first Time that, in either of his two Pages
against

against me, he has vouchsafed to do so, concerning *one Article*, wherewith he has made so much Noise. My Words in p. 167. of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, stand thus: "For that this is the
 " *sole Doctrine* pressed and required to
 " be believed in the whole Tenor of our
 " Saviour's and his Apostles preaching,
 " we have shew'd, through the whole Hi-
 " story of the Evangelists and Acts, and
 " I challenge them to shew that there was
 " any other Doctrine upon their Assent
 " to which, or Disbelief of it, Men were
 " pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and
 " accordingly received into the Church of
 " Christ, as Members of his Body, as far as
 " mere believing could make them so; or else
 " kept out. This was the only Gospel Ar-
 " ticle of Faith which was preached to
 " them." Out of this Page, the Unmasker
 sets down these Words; "This is the
 " *SOLE Doctrine* pressed and required
 " to be believed in the whole Tenor of our
 " Saviour's and his Apostles preaching,
 " p. 129. this was the *ONLY* Gospel Ar-
 " ticle of Faith which was preached to
 " them."

I shall pass by all other Observations, that this way of citing these Words would suggest, and only remark, that if he brought these Words to prove the immediately preceding Assertion of his, *viz.*

That

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 11

That to find out but one Article of Faith was the main Work I set my self about; this Argument reduced into Form, will stand thus:

He who says, that this is the sole Doctrine pressed and required to be believed, in the whole Tenor of our Saviour's and his Apostles Preaching, upon their Assent to which, or Disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and accordingly received into the Church of Christ, as Members of his Body, as far as meer believing could make them so, or else kept out, sets himself to find out but one Article of Faith, as his main Work. But the Vindicator did so: *Ergo,*

If this were the Use he would make of those Words of mine cited, I must desire him to prove the *major*. But he talks so freely, and without Book, every where, that I suppose he thought himself, by the Privilege of a Declaimer, exempt from being called strictly to an Account for what he so loosely says, and from proving what he should be called to Account for. Rail lustily, is a good Rule, something of it will stick, true or false, proved or not proved.

If he alledges these Words of mine, to answer my Demand, *Vind. p. 281.* where he found that *I contended for one single Article of Faith, with the Exclusion and Defiance*

fiance of all the rest which he had charged me with ; I say, it proves this as little as the former. For to say, " That I had " shew'd through the whole History of the " *Evangelists*, and the *Acts*, that this is " the sole Doctrine, or only Gospel-Article pressed and required to be believ'd " in the whole Tenor of our Saviour and " his Apostles preaching ; upon their Assent to which, or disbelieving of it, " Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and accordingly received into " the Church of Christ, or kept out ; " is the simple Assertion of a positive Matter of Fact, and so carries in it no *Defiance*, no, nor *Exclusion* of any other Doctrinal or Historical Truth contained in the Scripture : And therefore it remains still on the *Unmasker* to shew where 'tis I express any *Defiance* of any other Truth contain'd in the Word of God ; or where I exclude any one Doctrine of the Scriptures. So that if it be true, that *I contend for one Article*, my Contention may be without any *Defiance*, or so much as *Exclusion* of any of the rest, notwithstanding any Thing contained in these Words. Nay, if it should happen that I am in a Mistake, and that this was not the sole Doctrine which our Saviour and his Apostles preached, and upon their Assent to which, Men were admitted into the Church ; yet the
Un-

Unmasker's Accusation would be never the truer for that, unless it be necessary, that he that mistakes in one Matter of Fact, should be at *Defiance* with all other Truths; or, that he who erroneously says, that our Saviour and his Apostles admitted Men into the Church upon the believing him to be the *Messiah*, does thereby exclude all other Truths published to the *Jews* before, or to Christian Believers afterwards.

If these Words be brought to prove that I contended for *one Article*, barely *one Article*, without any *Defiance* or *Exclusion* annex'd to that Contention; I say, neither do they prove that, as is manifest from the Words themselves, as well as from what I said elsewhere concerning the Article of One God. For here, I say, this is the only Gospel-Article, &c. upon which Men were pronounced Believers; which plainly intimates some other Article known and believed in the World before, and without the Preaching of the Gospel.

To this the *Unmasker* thinks he has provided a *Salvo* in these Words, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 6. *And when I told him of this one Article, he knew well enough that I did not exclude the Article of the Deity; for that is a Principle of Natural Religion.* If it be fit for an *Unmasker* to perceive what is in Debate, he would know,

know, that the Question is not, what he *excluded* or *excluded not*, but what Articles he charged me to have *excluded*.

Taking it therefore to be his Meaning (which it must be, if he meant any Thing to the Purpose) *viz.* That when he charged me so often and positively for contesting for *one Article*, *viz.* that *Jesus was the Messiah*, he did not intend to accuse me for excluding *the Article of the Deity*. To prove that he did not so intend it, he tells me, That *I knew that he did not*.

Answ. How should I know it? He never told me so either in his Book, or otherwise. This I know, that he said, *p. 115.* That *I contended for one Article, with the Exclusion of all the rest*. If then the Belief of the Deity, be an Article of Faith, and be not the Article of *Jesus being the Messiah*, it is one of *the rest*; and, if *all the rest* were excluded, certainly that being one of *all the rest*, must be excluded. How then he could say, *I knew that he excluded it not*, i. e. meant not that I *excluded* it, when he positively says, I did *exclude* it, I cannot tell, unless he thought that I knew him so well, that when he said one Thing, I knew that he meant another, and that the quite contrary.

He now, it seems, acknowledges that I affirmed, that the Belief of the Deity, as well

well as of *Jesus* being the *Messiah*, was required to make a Man a Believer. The believing in *one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth*, is one Article; and in *Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord*, is another Article. These therefore being *two Articles*, and both asserted by me to be required to make a Man a Christian, let us see with what Truth or Ingenuity the *Unmasker* could apply, besides that above-mention'd, these following Expressions to me, as he does without any Exception. *Why then must there be one Article, and no more?* p. 115. *Going to make a Religion for his Mermidons, he contracts all into one Article, and will trouble them with no more,* p. 117. *Away with Systems, away with Creeds, let us have but one Article, though it be with Defiance of all the rest,* p. 118. *Thus we see why he reduces all Belief to that one Article before rehearsed,* p. 120. And all this without any the least Exception of the *Article of a Deity*, as he now pretends. Nor could he indeed, as is evident from his own Words, p. 121, 122. *To conclude; This Gentleman and his Fellows, are resolved to be Unitarians; they are for one Article of Faith, as well as one Person in the Godhead:— But if these learned Men were not prejudiced— they would perceive, that when the Catholick Faith is thus brought down to*
one

one single Article, *it will soon be reduced to none; the Unite will dwindle into a Cypher.* By which the Reader may see, that his Intention was, to persuade the World, that I reduced *ALL BELIEF*, the *CATHOLICK FAITH* (they are his own Words) *to one single Article and no more.* For if he had given but the least Hint that I allowed of *two*, all the Wit and Strength of Argument contained in *Unitaritans, Unite and Cypher*, with which he winds up all, had been utterly lost, and dwindled into palpable Non-sense.

To demonstrate that this was the Sense he would be understood in, we are but to observe what he says again, *p. 50.* of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where he tells his Readers, *That I and my Friends have new modelled the Apostles Creed; yea indeed, have presented them with ONE Article instead of TWELVE.* And hence we may see what Sincerity there is in the Reason he brings to prove that he did not exclude the *Article of the Deity.* For, says he, *p. 6. that is a Principle of Natural Religion.*

Ans. Ergo, He did not in positive Words, without any Exception, say, *I reduced all Belief, the Catholick Faith, to one single Article, and no more.* But to make good his Promise, *not to resemble me*
in

in the little Artifices of Evading, he wipes his Mouth, and says, at the Bottom of this Page, *But the Reader sees his* [the Vindicator's] *shuffling*. Whilst the Article of *One God* is a Part of *ALL* Belief, *a Part of the Catholick Faith*, *ALL* which he affirm'd I excluded, but the one Article concerning the *Messiah*, every one will see where the *Shuffling* is: And if it be not clear enough from those Words themselves, let those above quoted out of p. 50. of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where he says, *That I have new modell'd the Apostles Creed, and presented the World with ONE Article instead of TWELVE*, be an Interpretation of them. For if the Article of *One Eternal God, Maker of Heaven and Earth*, be one of the Articles of the Apostles Creed, and the one Article I presented them with be not that, 'tis plain he did, and would be understood to mean, that by my one Article I excluded that of the One Eternal God, which Branch soever of Religion, either Natural or Reveal'd, it belongs to.

I do not endeavour to *persuade the Reader*, as he says, p. 6. *that he misunderstood me*; but yet every Body will see, that he misrepresented me. And I challenge him to say, that those Expressions above quoted out of him, concerning *One Article*, in the obvious Sense of the

C

Words,

Words, as they stand in his Accusation of me, were true.

This lies so directly in his Face, that he labours mightily to get it off, and therefore adds these Words; *My Discourse did not treat (neither doth his Book run that Way) of Principles of Natural Religion, but of the Revealed, and particularly the Christian: Accordingly, this was it which I taxed him with, That of all the Principles and Articles of Christianity, he chose out but one as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.*

Answ. His Book was of — *Atheism*, which one may think should make his *Discourse treat of Natural Religion*. But I pass by that, and bid him tell me where he taxed me, *That of all the Principles and Articles of Christianity, I chose out but one*: Let him shew in all his Discourse but such a Word, or any Thing said like *one Article of Christianity*, and I will grant that he meant particularly, but spoke generally; misled his Reader, and left himself a Subterfuge. But if there be no Expression to be found in him tending that way, all this is but the covering of one Falshood with another, which thereby only becomes the grosser. Though if he had, in express Words, taxed me, *That of all the Principles and Articles of the Christian Religion, I chose out but one*; that
would

would not at all help him, till he farther declares, that the Belief of One God is not an *Article of the Christian Religion*. For of *ALL the Articles of the Christian Religion*, he says, *I chose but one*; which not being that of a Deity, his Words plainly import, that that was left out amongst the rest, unless it be possible for a Man to chuse but one Article of the Christian Religion, *viz.* That *Jesus is the Messiah*; and at the same Time to chuse two Articles of the Christian Religion, *viz.* That there is One Eternal God, and that *Jesus is the Messiah*. If he had spoken clearly, and, like a fair Man, he should have said, That he taxed me with chusing but one Article of Revealed Religion. This had been plain and direct to his Purpose: But then he knew the Falshood of it would be too obvious: For in the seven Pages wherein he taxes me so much with *one Article*, Christianity is several Times named, tho' not once to the Purpose he here pretends. But Revelation is not so much as once mention'd in them; nor, as I remember, in any of the Pages he bestows upon me.

To conclude, the several Passages above quoted out of him, concerning *one sole Article*, are all in general Terms, without any the least Limitation or Restriction; and as they stand in him, fit to persuade the Reader that I excluded all other Arti-

cles whatsoever, but that one of *Jesus the Messiah* : And if in that Sense they are not true, they are so many Falshoods of his repeated there, to mislead others into a wrong Opinion of me. For if he had had a Mind his Readers should have been rightly informed, why was it not as easy once to explain himself, as so often to affirm it in general and unrestrained Terms? This all the boasted Strength of the *Unmasker* will not be able to get him out of. This very well becomes one who so loudly charges me with *Shuffling*. Having repeated the same Thing over and over again, in as general Terms as was possible, without any the least Limitation in the whole Discourse, to have nothing else to plead when required to prove it, but that it was meant in a limited Sense, in an *Unmasker*, is not *Shuffling*. For, by this Way, he may have the Convenience to say and unsay what he pleases ; to vent what Stuff he thinks for his Turn ; and when he is called to an Account for it, reply, he meant no such Thing. Should any one publish, that the *Unmasker* had but *One Article of Faith, and no more, viz.* That the Doctrines in Fashion, and likely to procure Preferment, are alone to be received ; that *all his Belief* was comprised in this *one single Article* : And when such a Talker was demanded to prove his Assertion,

tion, should he say he meant to except his Belief of the Apostles Creed; would he not, notwithstanding such a Plea, be thought a shuffling Lyar? And if the *Unmasker* can no otherwise prove those universal Propositions above-cited, but by saying he meant them with a tacit Restriction (for none is expressed) they will still and for ever remain to be accounted for by his Veracity.

What he says in the next Paragraph, *p. 7. of my splitting One Article into Two*, is just of the same Force, and with the same Ingenuity. I had said, That the Belief of One God was necessary; which is not denied: I had also said, "That the
 " Belief of *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the
 " *Messiah*, together with those concomi-
 " tant Articles of his Resurrection, Rule,
 " and coming again to judge the World,
 " was necessary; *p. 248.* And again,
 " *p. 257.* That God had declared, who-
 " ever would believe *Jesus* to be the Sa-
 " viour promised, and take him now
 " raised from the Dead, and constituted
 " the Lord and Judge of all Men, to be
 " their King and Ruler, should be saved."
 This made me say *These* and *Those Articles* (in Words of the plural Number) more than once; Evidence enough to any but a Caviller, that I contended not for one single Article, and no more. And to mind

him of it, I in my *Vindication* reprinted one of those Places where I had done so; and that he might not, according to his manner, over-look what does not please him, the Words, **THESE ARE ARTICLES**, were printed in great Characters. Whereupon he makes this Remark, *p. 7. And though since he has tried to split this One into Two, p. 28. yet he labours in vain: For to believe Jesus to be the Messiah, amounts to the same with believing him to be King and Ruler; his being Anointed (i. e. being the Messiah) including that in it: Yet he has the Vanity to add in great Characters, THESE ARE ARTICLES; as if the putting them into these great Letters, would make One Article Two.*

Ans. Though no Letters will make One Article Two; yet that there is one God, and Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who rose again from the Dead, ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the Right-hand of God, shall come to judge the Quick and the Dead, are in the Apostles Creed set down as more than One Article, and therefore may very properly be called THESE ARTICLES; without splitting One into Two.

What, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I have said of *One Article*, I shall always own; and in what Sense I said it,

is

is easy to be understood; and with a Man of the least Candor, whose Aim was Truth, and not Wrangling, it would not have occasion'd one Word of Dispute. But as for this *Unmasker*, who makes it his Business not to convince me of any Mistakes in my Opinion, but barely to misrepresent me; my Business at present with him, is to shew the World that what he has capriciously and scurrilously said of me relating to *one Article*, is false; and that he neither has, nor can prove one of those Assertions concerning it, above-cited out of him in his own Words. Nor let him pretend a Meaning against his direct Words: Such a Caviller as he, who would shelter himself under the Pretence of a Meaning, whereof there are no Footsteps, whose Disputes are only Calumnies directed against the Author, without examining the Truth or Falshood of what I had published, is not to expect the Allowances one would make to a fair and ingenuous Adversary, who shew'd so much Concern for Truth, that he treated of it with a Seriousness due to the Weightiness of the Matter, and used other Arguments besides Obloquy, Clamour and Falshoods, against what he thought Error. And therefore I again positively demand of him to prove these Words of his to be true, or confess that he cannot: *viz.*

III. *That I contend for One Article of Faith, with the Exclusion and Defiance of all the rest.*

Two other Instances of this Sort of Arguments I gave in the 284th Page of my *Vindication*, out of the 115th and 119th Pages of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*; and I here demand of him again to shew, since he has not thought fit hitherto to give any Answer to it,

IV. *Where I urge, that there must be nothing in Christianity that is not plain, and exactly levelled to all Mens Mother Wit, and every common Apprehension.*

Or where he finds, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, this other Proposition:

V. *That the very Manner of every Thing in Christianity must be clear and intelligible; every Thing must immediately be comprehended by the weakest Noddle, or else it is no Part of Religion, especially of Christianity.*

These Things he must prove that I have said: I put it again upon him to shew where I said them, or else to confess the Forgery: For, till he does one or the other,
he

he shall be sure to have these, with a large Catalogue of other Falshoods, laid before him.

Page 25, of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, he endeavours to make good his Saying, That *I set up one Article, with Defiance of all the rest*, in these Words; *For what is excluding them wholly, but defying them? Wherefore seeing he utterly excludes all the rest, by representing them as USELESS to the making a Man a Christian, which is the Design of his whole Undertaking, it is manifest that he defies them.*

Ans. This at least is manifest from hence, That the *Unmasker* knows not, or cares not what he says. For, who ever, but he, thought that a bare *Exclusion*, or passing by, was *Defiance*? If he understands it so, I would advise him not to seek Preferment. For *Exclusions* will happen; and if every *Exclusion* be *Defiance*, a Man had need be well assured of his own good Temper, who shall not think his Peace and Charity in Danger, amongst so many Enemies that are at *Defiance* with him? *Defiance*, if with any Propriety it can be spoken of an Article of Faith, must signify a professed Enmity to it. For in its proper Use, which is to Persons, it signifies an open and declared Enmity raised to that Height, that he in whom it is, challenges

lenges the Party *defy'd* to battle, that he may there wreak his Hatred on his Enemy in his Destruction. So that *my Defiance of all the rest* remains still to be proved.

But, *Secondly*, There is another Thing *manifest* from these Words of his, *viz.* That notwithstanding his great Brags in his first Paragraph, his main Skill lies in fancying what would be for his Turn, and then confidently fathering it upon me. It never enter'd into my Thoughts, nor, I think, into any Body's else (I must always except the acute *Unmasker*, who makes no Difference between *Useful* and *Necessary*) that all but the fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith were *useless* to make a Man a Christian; though, if it be true, that the Belief of the Fundamentals alone (be they few or many) is all that is *necessary* to his being made a Christian, all that may any way persuade him to believe them, may certainly be useful towards the making him a Christian: And therefore here again I must propose to him, and leave it with him to be shew'd, where it is,

VI. *I have represented all the rest as useless to the making a Man a Christian? And how it appears, that this is the Design of my whole Undertaking?*

In his Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism, he says, p. 115. *What makes him contend for one single Article, with the Exclusion of all the rest? He pretends it is this, that all Men ought to understand their Religion.* This Reasoning I disowned, p. 282. of my *Vindication*; and intimated, that he should have quoted the Page where I so pretended. To this, p. 26. he tells me, with great Confidence, and in abundance of Words, as we shall see by and by, that I had done so; as if Repetition were a Proof. He had done better to have quoted one Place, where I so pretend. Indeed, p. 27. for want of something better, he quotes these Words of mine out of p. 258. of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*. *The all-merciful God seems herein to have consulted the Poor of this World, and the Bulk of Mankind: THESE ARE ARTICLES that the labouring and illiterate Man may comprehend.* I ask, whether it be possible for one to bring any thing more direct against himself? The Thing he was to prove was, that I contended for one single Article with the Exclusion

*clusion of all the rest, because I pretended that all Men ought to understand their Religion: i. e. The Reason I gave, why there was to be but one single Article in Religion, with the Exclusion of all the rest, was, because Men ought to understand their Religion. And the Place he brings to prove my Contending upon that Ground for one single Article, with the Exclusion of all the rest, is a Passage wherein I speak of more than one Article, and say These Articles. Whether I said These Articles properly or improperly, it matters not in the present Case (and that we have examin'd in another Place) 'tis plain, I meant more than one Article, when I said These Articles; and did not think, that the labouring and illiterate Man could not understand them, if they were more than one: And therefore I pretended not that there must be but one, because by illiterate Men more than one could not be understood. The rest of this Paragraph is nothing but a Repetition of the same Assertion without Proof, which with the *Unmasker* often passes for a Way of proving, but with no body else.*

But, that I may keep that Distance, which he boasts there is betwixt his and my Way of Writing, I shall not say this without Proofs. One Instance of his Repetition, of which there is such Plenty in his Book, pray take here. His Business,

p. 26. is to prove, that *I pretended that I contended for one single Article with the Exclusion of all the rest, because all Men ought to understand their Religion.* P. 282, of my *Vindication*, I denied that I had so pretended. To convince me that I had, thus he proceeds.

Unmasker. *He founds his Conceit of one Article partly upon this, that a Multitude of Doctrines is obscure, and hard to be understood.*

Ans. You say it, and had said it before: But I ask you, as I did before, where I did so?

Unm. *And therefore he trusses all up in one Article, that the poor People and Bulk of Mankind may bear it.*

Ans. I desire again to know where I made that Inference, and argued so for one Article.

Unm. *This is the Scope of a great Part of his Book.*

Ans. This is Saying again; shew it once.

Unm. *But his Memory does not keep Pace with his Invention, and thence he says, he remembers nothing of this in his Book, Vind. p. 282.*

Ans. This is to say, that it is in my Book. You have said it more than once already; I demand of you to shew me where?

Unm.

30 *A Second Vindication of the*

Unm. *This worthy Writer does not know his own Reasoning, that he uses.*

Answ. I ask, where does he use that Reasoning?

Unm. *As particularly thus, that he troubles Christian Men with no more but one Article: BECAUSE that is intelligible, and all People, high and low, may comprehend it.*

Answ. We have heard it affirm'd by you over and over again; but the Question still is, Where is that Way of arguing to be found in my Book?

Unm. *For he has chosen out, as he thinks, a plain and easy Article. Whereas the others, which are commonly propounded, are not generally agreed on (he saith) and are dubious and uncertain. But the Believing that Jesus is the Messiah, has nothing of Doubtfulness or Obscurity in it.*

Answ. The Word *For*, in the Beginning of this Sentence, makes it stand for one of your Reasons; though it be but a Repetition of the same Thing, in other Words.

Unm. *THIS the Reader will find to be the Drift and Design of several of his Pages.*

Answ. This must signify, *That I trouble Men with no more but one Article, because one only is intelligible, and then it is but a Repetition. If any thing else be meant by*

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 31

by the Word *This*, it is nothing to the Purpose. For that I said, that all Things necessary to be believed are plain in Scripture, and easy to be understood, I never denied; and should be very sorry, and recant it, if I had.

Unm. *And the Reason why I did not quote any single one of them, was, because he insists on it so long together; and spins it out after this Way, in p. 257. of his Reasonableness of Christianity, where he sets down the "short, plain, easy, and intelligible Summary (as he calls it) of Religion, couch'd in a single Article: He immediately adds, The All-merciful God seems herein to have consulted the Poor of this World, and the Bulk of Mankind: These are Articles (whereas he had set down but one) that the labouring and illiterate Man may comprehend."*

Ans. If *my insisting on it so long together*, was the Cause why, in your *Thoughts of the Causes of Atheism*, you did not quote any single Passage; methinks here, in your *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where you knew it was expected of you, *my insisting on it*, as you say, *so long together*, might have afforded at least one Quotation to your Purpose.

Unm. *He assigns this as a Ground why it was God's Pleasure that there should be but ONE POINT of Faith, BECAUSE*
thereby

thereby Religion may be understood the better; the Generality of the People may comprehend it.

Answ. I hear you say it again, but want a Proof still, and ask where I assign that Ground?

Unm. *This he represents as a great Kindness done by God to Man, whereas the Variety of Articles would be hard to be understood.*

Answ. Again the same Cabbage; an Affirmation, but no Proof.

Unm. *This he enlarges upon, and flourishes it over after his Fashion; and yet he desires to know, When he said so? Vindic. p. 284.*

Answ. And if I did, let the World here take a Sample of the *Unmasker's* Ability or Truth, who spends above two whole Pages, 26, 27. in Repetitions of the same Assertion, without the producing any but one Place, for Proof; and that too against him, as I have shewn. But he has not yet done with confounding me by dint of Repetition; he goes on,

Unm. *Good Sir, let me be permitted to acquaint you, that your Memory is as defective as your Judgment.*

Answ. I thank you for the Regard you have had to it; for often Repetition is a good Help to a bad Memory. In requital, I advise you to have some Eye to your own

own *Memory* and *Judgment* too; for one or both of them seem a little to blame, in the Reason you subjoin to the foregoing Words, viz.

Unm. For in the very Vindication you attribute it to the Goodness and Condescension of the Almighty, that he requires nothing as absolutely necessary to be believed, but what is suited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehension of illiterate Men.

Ans^w. I will, for the Unmasker's Sake, put this Argument of his into a Syllogism. If the *Vindicator*, in his *Vindication*, attributes it to the Goodness and Condescension of the Almighty, that he requires nothing to be believed, but what is suited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehension of illiterate Men; then he did, in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, pretend, that the Reason why he contended for one Article, with the Exclusion of all the rest, was, because all Men ought to understand their Religion.

But the *Vindicator*, in his *Vindication*, attributes it to the Goodness and Condescension of Almighty God, that he requires nothing to be believed, but what is suited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehension of illiterate Men.

Ergo, In his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, he pretended, that the Reason why he contended for one Article, with the Ex-

D

clusion

34 *A Second Vindication of the*
clusion of all the rest, was because all Men
ought to understand their Religion.

This was the Proposition to be proved,
and which, as he confesses here, p. 26. I
denied to remember to be in my *Reason-
ableness of Christianity*. Who can but ad-
mire his Logick!

But besides the Strength of *Judgment*,
which you have shewed in this clear and
cogent Reasoning, does not your *Memory*
too deserve its due Applause? You tell
me, in your *Socinianism Unmask'd*, that in
* p. 29. of my *Vindication*, I desired to
know *when* I said so. To which Desire
of mine you reply in these Words, before
cited: *Good Sir, let me be permitted to ac-
quaint you that your Memory is as defective
as your Judgment; for in the very Vindi-
cation you attribute it to the Goodness and
Condescension of the Almighty, that he re-
quires nothing as absolutely necessary to be
believed, but what is suited to vulgar Ca-
pacities, and the Comprehension of illiterate
Men*, p. 30.

Sure the *Unmasker* thinks himself at
cross Questions. I ask him, in the 29th
Page of my *Vindication*, *WHEN* I said so?
And he answers, that I had said so in the
30th Page of my *Vindication*; i. e. when
I writ the 29th Page, I ask'd the Question,

* Page 284. of the former Volume.

When I had said what he charg'd me with saying? And I am answer'd, I had said it in the 30th Page; which was not yet written: *i. e.* I ask'd the Question to-day, *WHEN* I had said so? And I am answer'd, I had said it to-morrow. As apposite and convincing an Answer, to make good his Charge, as if he had said, To-morrow I found a Horse-shoe. But perhaps this judicious Disputant will ease himself of this Difficulty, by looking again into the 29th Page of my *Vindication*, out of which he cites these Words for mine; *I desire to know WHEN I said so?* But my Words in that Place are, *I desire to know WHERE I said so?* A Mark of his Exactness in quoting, when he vouchsafes to do it. For *Unmaskers*, when they turn Disputants, think it the best Way to talk at large, and charge home in Generals; but do not often find it convenient to quote Pages, set down Words, and come to Particulars. But if he had quoted my Words right, his Answer had been just as pertinent. For I ask him *WHERE*, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I had said so? And he answers, I had said so in my *Vindication*. For *where*, in my Question, refers to my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, which the *Unmasker* had seen, and charg'd with this Saying; and could not refer to my *Vindication*, which he had not yet seen,

nor to a Passage in it, which was not then written. But this is nothing with an *Unmasker*; therefore, what is yet worse, those Words of mine, *Vindic.* p. 29. relate not to the Passage he is here proving I had said, but to another different from it; as different as it is to say, *That because all Men are to understand their Religion, therefore there is to be but one Article in it*; and to say, *That there must be nothing in Christianity that is not plain and exactly levell'd to all Mens Mother Wit*: Both which he falsely charges on me; but 'tis only to the latter of them, that my Words, *I desire to know where I said so?* are applied.

Perhaps the well-meaning Man sees no Difference between these two Propositions; yet I shall take the Liberty to ask him again, *Where* I said either of them, as if they were two? Although he should accuse me again of *excepting against the Formality of Words*, and doing so foolish a Thing, as to expect that a disputing *Unmasker* should account for his Words, or any Proposition he advances. 'Tis his Privilege to plead he did not mean as his Words import, and without any more ado he is assail'd, and he is the same *Unmasker* he was before. But let us hear him out on the Argument he was upon, for his Repetitions on it are not yet done. His next Words are,

Unm.

Unm. *It is clear then, that you found your ONE Article on this, that it is suited to the vulgar Capacities: Whereas the other Articles, mentioned by me, are obscure and ambiguous, and therefore surpass the Comprehension of the illiterate.*

Ans. The latter Part indeed is now the first Time imputed to me; but all the rest is nothing but an unprov'd Repetition, though ushered in with, *it is clear then*; Words that should have a Proof going before them.

Unm. *But yet you pretend, that you have forgot that any such Thing was said by you.*

Ans. I have indeed forgot, and notwithstanding all your Pains by so many Repetitions to beat it into my Head, I fear I shall never remember it.

Unm. *Which shews that you are careless of your Words, and that you forget what you write.*

Ans. So you told me before, and this repeating of it does no more convince me than that did.

Unm. *What shall we say to an oblivious Author?*

Ans. Shew it him in his Book, or else he will never be able to remember that it is there, nor any body else be able to find it.

Unm. *He takes no notice of what falls from his own Pen.*

Answ. So you have told him more than once. Try him once with shewing it him, amongst other Things which fell from his own Pen, and see what then he will say: That perhaps may refresh his Memory.

Unm. *And therefore within a Page or two he confutes himself, and gives himself the Lye.*

Answ. 'Tis a Fault he deserves to be told of over and over again. But he says, he shall not be able to find the two Pages wherein he *gives himself the Lye*, unless you set down their Numbers, and the Words in them, which confute, and which are confuted.

I beg my Reader's Pardon, for laying before him so large a Pattern of our *Unmasker's* new-fashion'd Stuff; his fine Tissue of Argumentation not easily to be match'd, but by the same Hand. But it lay all together in *p.* 26, 27, 28. and it was fit the Reader should have this one Instance of the Excellencies he promises in his first Paragraph, in opposition to my *Impertinencies, Incoherencies, weak and feeble Struglings*. Other Excellencies he there promised upon the same Ground, which I shall give my Reader a Taste of in fit Places: Not but that the Whole is of a Piece, and one cannot miss some of them in every Page; but to transcribe them all, would be more than they are worth. If
any

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 39
any one desires more Plenty, I send him to
his Book it self. But saying a thousand
Times not being proving once, it remains
upon him still to shew,

VII. Where, in my *Reasonableness of
Christianity*, I pretend that I contend
for one single Article, with the Exclu-
sion of all the rest, because all Men ought
to understand their Religion?

And in the next Place, Where it is that
I say,

VIII. That there must be nothing in *Chri-
stianity* that is not plain, and exactly
level to all Mens Mother-Wit?

Let us now return to his 8th Page. For
the bundling together, as was fit, all that
he has said in distant Places upon the Sub-
ject of *One Article*, has made me trespass
a little against the *Jewish* Character of a
well-bred Man, recommended by him to
me out of the *Mishna*: Though I propose
to my self to follow him, as near as I can,
Step by Step, as he proceeds.

In the 110th and 111th Pages of his
Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism,
he gave us a List of his *Fundamental Ar-
ticles*: Upon which I thus applied my self
to him, *Vind.* p. 273. " Give me Leave

“ now to ask you seriously, Whether these
 “ you have here set down under the Title
 “ of *Fundamental Doctrines*, are such (when
 “ reduc’d to Propositions) that every one
 “ of them is required to make a Man a
 “ Christian; and such, as without the actual
 “ Belief thereof, he cannot be saved? If
 “ they are not so, every one of them (you
 “ may call them *Fundamental Doctrines* as
 “ much as you please) they are not of those
 “ Doctrines of Faith I was speaking of;
 “ which are only such as are required to
 “ be actually believed, to make a Man a
 “ Christian.” And again, *Vindic.* p. 275.
 I ask him, “ Whether just these, neither
 “ more nor less,” were those necessary Ar-
 ticles?

To which we have his Answer, *Socinianism Unmask’d*, p. 8, &c. From p. 8. to 20. he has quoted near forty Texts of Scripture; of which he saith, p. 21. *Thus I have briefly set before the Reader those Evangelical Truths, those Christian Principles, which belong to the very Essence of Christianity: I have proved them to be such, and I have reduc’d most of them to certain Propositions, which is a Thing the Vindicator call’d for.*

Ans. Yes: But that was not all the *Vindicator* call’d for, and had reason to expect. For I ask’d, “ Whether those the
 “ *Unmasker* gave us in his *Thoughts con-*
cerning

“ *cerning the Causes of Atheism*, were the
“ Fundamental Doctrines, without an
“ actual Belief whereof a Man could not
“ be a Christian ; just all, neither more
“ nor less ?” This I had reason to demand from him, or from any one, who questions that Part of my Book ; and I shall insist upon it till he does it, or confesses he cannot. For having set down the Articles, which the Scripture, upon a diligent Search, seem’d to me to require as necessary, and only necessary ; I shall not lose my Time in examining what another says against those Fundamentals, which I have gather’d out of the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles, till he gives me a List of his Fundamentals, which he will abide by ; that so by comparing them together, I may see which is the true Catalogue of Necessaries. For after so serious and diligent a Search, which has given me Light and Satisfaction in this great Point, I shall not quit it, and set my self on float again, at the Demand of any one who would have me be of his Faith, without telling me what it is. Those Fundamentals the Scripture has so plainly given, and so evidently determined, that it would be the greatest Folly imaginable to part with this Rule for asking ; and give up my self blindly to the Conduct of one, who either knows not, or will not tell me, what are the
the

the Points necessary to be believed to make me a Christian. He that shall find fault with my Collection of Fundamentals only to unsettle me, and not to give me a better of his own, I shall not think worth minding, till, like a fair Man, he puts himself upon equal Terms, and makes up the Defects of mine by a compleat one of his own: For a Deficiency or Error in one Necessary is as fatal, and as certainly excludes a Man from being a Christian, as in an hundred. When any one offers me a compleat Catalogue of his Fundamentals, he does not unreasonably demand me to quit mine for nothing: I have then one, that being set by mine, I may compare them; and so be able to chuse the true and perfect one, and relinquish the other.

He that does not do this, plainly declares, that (without shewing me the certain Way to Salvation) he expects that I should depend on him with an implicit Faith, whilst he reserves to himself the Liberty to require of me to believe what he shall think fit, as he sees Occasion; and, in Effect, says thus: “ Distrust those Fundamentals, which the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles have shew’d to be all that is necessary to be believed, to make a Man a Christian; and though I cannot tell you, what are those other Articles, which are necessary and sufficient

“cient to make a Man a Christian, yet
“take me for your Guide, and that is as
“good as if I made up, in a compleat List,
“the Defect of your Fundamentals.” To
which this is a sufficient Answer: *Si quid
novisti rectius, imperti; si non, his utere
mecum.*

The *Unmasker*, of his own Accord,
p. 110. of his *Thoughts concerning the Cau-
ses of Atheism*, sets down several, which
he calls *Fundamental Doctrines*. I ask
him, Whether those be all? For Answer,
he adds more to them, in his *Socinianism
Unmask'd*: But in a great Part refuses to
tell me, whether this second List of Fun-
damentals be compleat; and, instead of
answering so reasonable a Demand, pays
me with ill Language, in these Words,
pag. 22. subjoin'd to those last quoted:
*If what I have said will not content him,
I am sure I can do nothing that will; and
therefore if he should capriciously require
any thing more, it would be as great Folly
in me to comply with it, as it is in him to
move it.* If I did ask a Question which
troubles you, be not so angry; you your
self were the Occasion of it. I propos'd
my Collection of Fundamentals; which I
had with great Care sought, and thought
I had found clear in the Scripture. You
tell me no, it is imperfect, and offer me
one of your own. I ask, whether that be
perfect?

perfect? Thereupon you grow into Choler, and tell me 'tis a foolish Question. Why then I think it was not very wise in you so forwardly to offer one, unless you had had one ready, not liable to the same Exception. Would you have me so foolish to take a List of Fundamentals from you, who have not yet one for yourself; nor are yet resolved with your self, what Doctrines are to be put in, or left out of it? Farther, pray tell me, if you had a settled Collection of Fundamentals that you would stand to, why should I take them from you upon your Word, rather than from an *Anabaptist*, or a *Quaker*, or an *Arminian*, or a *Socinian*, or a *Lutheran*, or a *Papist*; who, I think, are not perfectly agreed with you, or one another, in Fundamentals? And yet there is none amongst them, that I have not as much Reason to believe upon his bare Word, as an *Unmasker*, who, to my certain Knowledge, will make bold with Truth. If you set up for Infallibility, you may have some Claim to have your bare Word taken, before any other but the Pope. But yet, if you demand to be an unquestionable Proposer of what is absolutely necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, you must perform it a little better than hitherto you have done. For it is not enough sometimes to give us Texts of Scripture; sometimes Propositions
of

of your own framing, and sometimes Texts of Scripture, out of which they are to be fram'd; as *Page 14.* you say, *These and the like Places, afford us such Fundamental and Necessary Doctrines as these:* And again, *p. 16.* after the naming several other Texts of Scripture, you add; *which Places yield us such Propositions as these;* and then in both Places set down what you think fit to draw out of them. And *p. 15.* you have these Words: *And here likewise it were easy to shew, that Adoption, Justification, Pardon of Sins, &c. which are Privileges and Benefits bestow'd upon us by the Messiah, are Necessary Matters of our Belief.* By all which, as well as the whole Frame, wherein you make shew of giving us your Fundamental Articles, it is plain, that what you have given us there, is nothing less than a compleat Collection of Fundamentals, even in your own Opinion of it.

But, good Sir, Why is it a foolish Question in me? You have found fault with my Summary for being short: The Defect in my Collection of necessary Articles, has rais'd your Zeal into so severe Censures, and drawn upon me, from you, so heavy a Condemnation, that if half that you have said of me be true, I am in a very ill Case, for having so curtailed the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity. Is
it

it *Folly* then for me to ask from you a compleat Creed? If it be so dangerous (as certainly it is) to fail in any necessary Article of Faith, Why is it *Folly* in me to be instant with you to give me them all? Or, why is it *Folly* in you to grant so reasonable a Demand? A short Faith, defective in Necessaries, is no more tolerable in you, than in me; nay, much more inexcusable, if it were for no other Reason but this, that you rest in it your self, and would impose it on others; and yet do not your self know, or believe it to be compleat. For if you do, Why dare you not say so, and give it us all intire, in plain Propositions; and not as you have in great Measure done here, give only the Texts of Scripture, from whence, you say, necessary Articles are to be drawn? Which is too great an Uncertainty for Doctrines absolutely necessary. For possibly all Men do not understand those Texts alike, and some may draw Articles out of them quite different from your System; and so though they agree in the same Texts, may not agree in the same Fundamentals; and till you have set down plainly and distinctly your Articles, that you think contained in them, cannot tell whether you will allow them to be Christians or no. For you know, Sir, several Inferences are often drawn from the same Text; and the different

ferent Systems of dissenting (I was going to say Christians, but that none must be so, but those who receive your Collection of Fundamentals, when you please to give it them) Professors, are all founded on the Scripture.

Why, I beseech you, is mine a *foolish* Question to ask, What are the necessary Articles of Faith? 'Tis of no less Consequence than, nor much different from the Jaylor's Question in the sixteenth of the *Acts*, *What shall I do to be saved?* and that was not, that ever I heard, counted by any one a *foolish Question*. You grant, there are Articles necessary to be believed for Salvation: Would it not then be Wisdom to know them? Nay, is it not our Duty to know and believe them? If not, Why do you with so much Out-cry reprehend me, for not knowing them? Why do you fill your Books with such Variety of Invectives, as if you could never say enough, nor bad enough, against me, for having left out some of them? And if it be so dangerous, so criminal, to miss any of them, Why is it a *Folly* in me to move you to give me a compleat List?

If Fundamentals are to be known, easy to be known (as without Doubt they are) then a Catalogue may be given of them. But if they are not, if it cannot certainly be determined which are they; but the doubt-

doubtful Knowledge of them depends upon Guesses, Why may not I be permitted to follow my Guesses as well as you yours? Or why, of all others, must you prescribe your Guesses to me, when there are so many that are as ready to prescribe as you, and of as good Authority? The Pretence indeed, and Clamour is Religion, and the Saving of Souls: But your Business 'tis plain is nothing, but to over-rule and prescribe, and be hearken'd to as a Dictator; and not to inform, teach, and instruct in the sure Way to Salvation. Why else do you so start and fling, when I desire to know of you, what is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, when this is the only material Thing in Controversy between us; and my Mistake in it has made you begin a Quarrel with me, and let loose your Pen against me in no ordinary Way of Reprehension?

Besides, in this Way which you take, you will be in no better a Case than I. For another having as good a Claim to have his Guesses give the Rule, as you yours; or to have his System receiv'd, as well as you yours; he will complain of you as well, and upon as good Grounds, as you do of me; and (if he have but as much Zeal for his Orthodoxy as you shew for yours) in as civil, well-bred and Christian-like Language.

In

In the next Place, pray tell me, why would it be *Folly* in you to comply with what I require of you? Would it not be useful to me to be set right in this Matter? If so, why is it *Folly* in you to set me right? Consider me, if you please, as one of your Parishioners, who (after you have resolv'd which Catalogue of Fundamentals to give him, either that in your *Thoughts of the Causes of Atheism*, or this other here in your *Socinianism Unmask'd*; for they are not both the same, nor either of them perfect) ask'd you, Are these all Fundamental Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; and are there no more but these? Would you answer him, that it was *Folly* in you to comply with him, in what he desir'd? Is it of no Moment to know, what is required of Men to be believed; without a Belief of which they are not Christians, nor can be saved? And is it *Folly* in a Minister of the Gospel to inform one, committed to his Instruction, in so material a Point as this, which distinguishes Believers from Unbelievers? Is it *Folly* in one, whose Business it is to bring Men to be Christians, and to Salvation, to resolve a Question, by which they may know whether they are Christians or no; and without a Resolution of which they cannot certainly know their Condition, and the State they are in?

E

Is

Is it besides your Commission and Business, and therefore a *Folly*, to extend your Care of Souls so far as this, to those who are committed to your Charge?

Sir, I have a Title to demand this of you, as if I were your Parishioner: You have forced your self upon me for a Teacher in this very Point, as if you wanted a Parishioner to instruct: And therefore I demand it of you, and shall insist upon it, till you either do it, or confess you cannot. Nor shall it excuse you, to say it is *capriciously* required. For this is no otherwise *capricious*, than all Questions are *capricious* to a Man that cannot answer them; and such an one I think this is to you. For if you could answer it, no Body can doubt but that you would, and that with Confidence: For no Body will suspect 'tis the Want of that makes you so reserv'd. This is indeed a frequent Way of answering Questions, by Men that cannot otherwise cover the Absurdities of their Opinions, and their Insolence of expecting to be believed upon their bare Words, by saying they are *capriciously* ask'd, and deserve no other Answer.

But how far soever *Capriciousness* (when proved, for saying is not enough) may excuse from answering a material Question, yet your own Words here will clear this from being a *capricious* Question in me:
For

For that those Texts of Scripture which you have set down, do not, upon your own Grounds, contain all the Fundamental Doctrines of Religion, all that is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, what you say a little lower, in this very Page, as well as in other Places, does demonstrate. Your Words are; *I think I have sufficiently proved, that there are other Doctrines besides that [Jesus is the Messiah] which are required to be believed to make a Man a Christian; Why did the Apostles write these Doctrines? Was it not that those they writ to, might give their Assent to them?* This Argument for the Necessity of believing the Texts you cite, from their being set down in the New Testament, you urged thus, p. 9. *Is this set down to no Purpose in these inspired Epistles? Is it not requisite that we should know it, and believe?* And again, p. 29. *They are in our Bibles to that very Purpose to be believed.* If then it be necessary to know and believe those Texts of Scripture you have collected, because the Apostles writ them, and they were not set down to no Purpose; and they are in our Bibles on purpose to be believ'd; I have reason to demand of you other Texts, besides those you have enumerated, as containing Points necessary to be believed; because there are other Texts which the

Apostles writ, and were not set down to no Purpose, and are in our Bibles on purpose to be believed, as well as those which you have cited.

Another Reason of doubting, and consequently of demanding, whether those Propositions you have set down for Fundamental Doctrines, be every one of them necessary to be believed, and all that are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, I have from your next Argument; which, joined to the former, stands thus, p. 22. *Why did the Apostles write these Doctrines? Was it not that those they writ to, might give their Assent to them? Nay, did they not require Assent to them? Yes verily, for this is to be proved from the Nature of the Things contained in these Doctrines, which are such as had immediate Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means and Issue of their Redemption and Salvation. If therefore all Things which have an immediate Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation, are those, and those only, which are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; may a Man not justly doubt whether those Propositions which the Unmasker has set down, contain all those Things; and whether there be not other Things contained in other Texts of Scripture, or in some of those cited*

cited by him, but otherwise understood, that *have as immediate a Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*, as those he has set down? And therefore I have reason to demand a compleater List: For at best, to tell us, that *all Things that have an immediate Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*, is but a general Description of Fundamentals, with which some may think *some* Articles agree, and others *others*: And the Terms *immediate Respect*, may give Ground enough for Difference about them, to those who agree that the rest of your Description is right. My Demand therefore is not a general Description of Fundamentals, but for the Reasons above-mention'd, the particular Articles themselves, which are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

It is not my Business at present to examine the Validity of these Arguments of his, to prove all the Propositions to be necessary to be belived, which he has here in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, set down as such. The Use I make of them now, is to shew the Reason they afford me to doubt, that those Propositions which he has given us for Doctrines necessary to be believed, are either not all such, or more than all,

by his own Rule: And therefore I must desire him to give us a compleater Creed, that we may know what in his Sense is necessary, and enough to make a Man a Christian.

Nor will it be sufficient in this Case to do, what he tells us he has done, in these Words, *p. 21. I have briefly set before the Reader those Evangelical Truths, those Christian Principles which belong to the very Essence of Christianity;—and I have reduced most of them to certain Propositions, which is a Thing the Vindicator call'd for,* *p. 274.* With Submission, I think, he mistakes the *Vindicator*. What I call'd for was, not that *most of them* should be *reduced to certain Propositions*, but that all of them should: And the Reason of my demanding that, was plain, *viz.* that then having the *Unmasker's* Creed in clear and distinct Propositions, I might be able to examine, whether it was what God in the Scriptures indispensably requir'd of every Man to make him a Christian, that so I might thereby correct the Errors or Defects of what I at present apprehended the Scripture taught me in the Case.

The *Unmasker* endeavours to excuse himself from answering my Question by another Exception against it, *p. 24.* in these Words: *Surely none but this Upstart Racovian will have the Confidence to deny, that*

that these Articles of Faith are such as are necessary to constitute a Christian, as to the Intellectual and Doctrinal Part of Christianity; such as must IN SOME MEASURE be known and assented to by him. Not that a Man is suppos'd every Moment actually to exert his Assent and Belief; for none of the Moral Virtues, none of the Evangelical Graces are exerted thus always. Wherefore that Question, in p. 273. (though he says he asks it seriously) might have been spared, "Whether every one of these " Fundamentals is required to be believed " to make a Man a Christian, and such as " without the actual Belief thereof, he " cannot be saved?" Here is Seriousness pretended when there is none; for the Design is only to cavil, and (if he can) to expose my Assertion. But he is not able to do it, for all his critical Demands are answer'd in these few Words, viz. That the Intellectual (as well as Moral Endowments) are not supposed to be always in act: They are exerted upon occasion, not all of them at a Time. And therefore he mistakes if he thinks, or rather as he objects without thinking, that these Doctrines, if they be Fundamental and Necessary, must be always actually believed. No Man besides himself ever started such a Thing.

This terrible long Combat has the Unmasker managed with his own Shadow, to

confound the *Seriousness* of my Question; and, as he says himself, is come off not only safe and sound, but triumphant. But for all that, Sir, may not a Man's Question be *serious*, though he should chance to express it ill? I think you and I were not best to set up for Criticks in Language, and Nicety of Expression, for fear we should set the World a laughing. Yet, for this once, I shall take the Liberty to defend mine here. For I demand, in what Expression of mine I said, or *suppos'd*, that a Man should every Moment actually exert his Assent to any Proposition requir'd to be believ'd? Cannot a Man say, that the *Unmasker* cannot be admitted to any Pre ferment in the Church of *England* without an *actual Assent* to, or subscribing of the Thirty Nine Articles; unless it be *supposed* that he must every Moment, from the Time he first read, assented to, and subscribed those Articles, till he received Institution and Induction, *actually exert his Assent* to every one of them, and repeat his Subscription? In the same Sense it is literally true, that a Man cannot be admitted into the Church of Christ, or into Heaven, without *actually* believing all the Articles necessary to make a Man a Christian, without supposing, that he must *actually exert that Assent every Moment*, from the Time that he first gave it, till the
Mo-

Moment that he is admitted into Heaven. He may eat, drink, make Bargains, study *Euclid*, and think of other Things between; nay, sometimes sleep, and neither think of those Articles, nor any Thing else; and yet it be true, that he shall not be admitted into the Church, or Heaven, without an *actual Assent* to them: That Condition of an *actual Assent* he has perform'd, and until he recal that Assent by actual Unbelief, it stands good; and though a Lunacy or Lethargy should seize on him presently after, and he should never think of it again as long as he lived, yet it is literally true, he is not saved without an *actual Assent*. You might therefore have spared your Pains in saying, *That none of the Moral Virtues, none of the Evangelical Graces, are exerted THUS always*, till you meet with some Body who said *THUS*. That I did so, I think would have enter'd into no Body's Thoughts but yours, it being evident from p. 254. of my Book, that by *Actual* I meant *Explicit*. You should rather have given a direct Answer to my Question, which I here again *seriously ask* you, *viz.* Whether,

IX. Those you call'd *Fundamental Doctrines*, in your *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, or those *Christian Principles which belong to the*
very

very Effence of Christianity, so many as you have given us of them in your *Socinianism Unmask'd* (for you may take which of your two Creeds you please) are just those, neither more nor less, that are every one of them requir'd to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, and such as without the actual, or (since that Word displeases you) the explicit Belief whereof he cannot be saved?

When you have answer'd this Question, we shall then see which of us two is nearest the right: But if you shall forbear railing, which, I fear, you take for arguing, against that Summary of Faith, which our Saviour and his Apostles taught, and which only they propos'd to their Hearers to be believed to make them Christians, till you have found another perfect Creed, of only necessary Articles, that you dare own for such; you are like to have a large Time of Silence. Before I leave the Passage above cited, I must desire the Reader to take Notice of what he says concerning his List of Fundamentals, *viz.* That *these his Articles of Faith, necessary to constitute a Christian, are such as must IN SOME MEASURE be known, and assented to by him*: A very wary Expression, concerning Fundamentals! The Question

tion is about Articles necessary to be explicitly believed, to make a Man a Christian. These, in his List, the *Unmasker* tells us, are *necessary to constitute a Christian; and must, IN SOME MEASURE, be known and assented to.* I would now fain know of the Reader, Whether he understands hereby that the *Unmasker* means that these, his necessary Articles, must be explicitly believed, or not? If he means an explicit Knowledge and Belief, why does he puzzle his Reader by so improper a Way of speaking? For what is as compleat and perfect as it ought to be, cannot properly be said to be *in some Measure.* If his *in some Measure* falls short of explicitly knowing and believing his Fundamentals, his necessary Articles are such as a Man may be a Christian without explicitly knowing and believing; *i. e.* are no Fundamentals, no necessary Articles at all. Thus Men, uncertain what to say, betray themselves by their great Caution.

Having pronounced it *Folly* in himself to make up the Defects of my short, and therefore so much blam'd Collection of Fundamentals, by a full one of his own, though his Attempt shews he would if he could, he goes on thus, *p. 22. From what I [the Unmasker] have said, it is evident, that the Vindicator is grossly mistaken, when he saith, " Whatever Doctrine the Apostles*
" re-

*“ requir’d to be believ’d to make a Man a
 “ Christian, are to be found in those Places
 “ of Scripture which he has quoted in his
 “ Book.”* And a little lower; *I think I
 have sufficiently prov’d that there are other
 Doctrines besides that, which are required
 to be believed to make a Man a Christian.*

Ans.w. Whatever you have proved, or
 (as you never fail to do) boast you have
 proved, will signify nothing, till you have
 proved one of these Propositions; and have
 shewn either,

X. That what our Saviour and his Apo-
 stles preached, and admitted Men into
 the Church for believing, is not all
 that is absolutely required to make a
 Man a Christian. Or,

That the believing him to be the *Mes-
 siab*, was not the only Article they
 insisted on, to those who acknow-
 ledged one God; and upon the Be-
 lief whereof they admitted Converts
 into the Church, in any one of those
 many Places quoted by me out of the
 History of the *New Testament*.

I say, *any one*: For though it be evident,
 throughout the whole Gospel, and the
Acts, that this was the one Doctrine of
 Faith, which in all their Preachings every
 where they principally drive at; yet if it

I were

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 61

were not so, but that in other Places they taught other Things, That would not prove that those other Things were Articles of Faith absolutely, necessarily required to be believed to make a Man a Christian, unless it had been so said. Because if it appears, that ever any one was admitted into the Church by our Saviour, or his Apostles, without having that Article explicitly laid before him, and without his explicit Assent to it, you must grant, that an explicit Assent to that Article is not necessary to make a Man a Christian: Unless you will say, that our Saviour and his Apostles admitted Men into the Church that were not qualified with such a Faith, as was absolutely necessary to make a Man a Christian; which is as much as to say, that they allowed and pronounced Men to be Christians, who were not Christians. For he that wants what is necessary to make a Man a Christian, can no more be a Christian, than he that wants what is necessary to make him a Man, can be a Man. For what is necessary to the Being of any Thing, is essential to its Being; and any Thing may be as well without its Essence, as without any Thing that is necessary to its Being: And so a Man be a Man without being a Man, and a Christian a Christian without being a Christian; and an *Unmasker* may
prove

prove this without proving it. You may therefore set up, by your unquestionable Authority, what Articles you please, as necessary to be believ'd, to make a Man a Christian. If our Saviour and his Apostles admitted Converts into the Church without preaching those your Articles to them, or requiring an explicit Assent to what they did not preach and explicitly lay down, I shall prefer their Authority to yours; and think it was rather by them, than by you, that God promulgated the Law of Faith, and manifested what that Faith was, upon which he would receive penitent Converts.

And though by his Apostles our Saviour taught a great many other Truths, for the explaining this Fundamental Article of the Law of Faith, that Jesus is the Messiah; some whereof have a nearer, and some a more remote Connection with it, and so cannot be denied by any Christian, who sees that Connection, or knows they are so taught; yet an explicit Belief of any one of them is no more necessarily required to make a Man a Christian, than an explicit Belief of all those Truths which have a Connection with the Being of a God, or are revealed by him, is necessarily required to make a Man not to be an Atheist: Though none of them can be denied by any one, who sees that Connection, or ac-
know-

knowledges that Revelation, without his being an Atheist. All these Truths taught us from God, either by Reason or Revelation, are of great Use to enlighten our Minds, confirm our Faith, stir up our Affections, &c. And the more we see of them, the more we shall see, admire, and magnify the Wisdom, Goodness, Mercy, and Love of God, in the Work of our Redemption. This will oblige us to search and study the Scripture, wherein it is contained, and laid open to us.

All that we find in the Revelation of the *New Testament*, being the declared Will and Mind of our Lord and Master, the *Messiah*, whom we have taken to be our King, we are bound to receive as Right and Truth, or else we are not his Subjects; we do not believe him to be the *Messiah*, our King, but cast him off, and with the *Jews* say, *We will not have this Man reign over us.* But it is still what we find in the Scripture, not in this or that System; what we, sincerely seeking to know the Will of our Lord, discover to be his Mind. Where it is spoken plainly, we cannot miss it; and it is evident he requires our Assent: Where there is Obscurity, either in the Expressions themselves, or by reason of the seeming Contrariety of other Passages, there a fair Endeavour, as much as our Circumstances will permit, secures us from

a guilty Disobedience to his Will, or a sinful Error in Faith, which way soever our Enquiry resolves the Doubt, or perhaps leaves it unresolved. If he had required more of us in those Points, he would have declared his Will plainer to us, and discovered the Truth contained in those obscure, or seemingly contradictory Places, as clearly and as uniformly as he did that Fundamental Article, that we were to believe him to be the *Messiah*, our King.

As Men, we have God for our King, and are under the Law of Reason: As Christians, we have *Jesus* the *Messiah* for our King, and are under the Law revealed by him in the Gospel. And though every Christian, both as a *Deist* and a *Christian*, be obliged to study both the Law of Nature and the revealed Law, that in them he may know the Will of God, and of *Jesus Christ* whom he hath sent; yet in neither of these Laws is there to be found a select Set of Fundamentals, distinct from the rest, which are to make him a *Deist* or a *Christian*. But he that believes one eternal, invisible God, his Lord and King, ceases thereby to be an Atheist; and he that believes *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, his King, ordained by God, thereby becomes a Christian, is delivered from the Power of Darkness, and is translated into the Kingdom of the Son of God, is actually within the
Covenant

Covenant of Grace, and has that Faith which shall be imputed to him for Righteousness; and if he continues in his Allegiance to this his King, shall receive the Reward, eternal Life.

He that considers this, will not be so hot as the *Unmasker*, to contend for a Number of Fundamental Articles, all necessary, every one of them, to be explicitly believed by every one for Salvation, without knowing them himself, or being able to enumerate them to another. Can there be any Thing more absurd than to say, There are several Fundamental Articles, each of which every Man must explicitly believe, upon pain of Damnation, and yet not to be able to say which they be? The *Unmasker* has set down no small Number; but yet dares not say, These are all. On the contrary, he has plainly confessed there are more; but will not, *i. e.* cannot tell what they are that remain behind: Nay, has given a general Description of his Fundamental Articles, by which it is not evident but there may be ten times as many as those he had named; and amongst them (if he durst, or could name them) probably several, that many a good Christian, who died in the Faith, and is now in Heaven, never once thought of; and others, which many, of as good Authority as he, would, from their different Systems, certainly deny and contradict.

F

This,

This, as great an Absurdity as it is, cannot be otherwise, whilst Men will take upon them to alter the Terms of the Gospel; and, when it is evident that our Saviour and his Apostles received Men into the Church, and pronounced them Believers, for taking him to be the *Messiah*, their King and Deliverer, sent by God, have the Boldness to say, this is not enough: But when you would know of them what is enough, they cannot tell you. The Reason whereof is visible, *viz.* because they being able to produce no other Reason for their Collection of Fundamental Articles, to prove them necessary to be believed, but because they are of divine Authority, and contained in the Holy Scriptures; and are, as the *Unmasker* says, *writ there on purpose to be believed*, they know not where to stop, when they have once begun: Those Texts that they leave out, or from which they deduce none of their Fundamentals, being of the same divine Authority, and so upon that Account equally Fundamental with what they culled out, though not so well suited to their particular Systems.

Hence come those endless and unreasonable Contentions about Fundamentals, whilst each censures the Defect, Redundancy, or Falshood of what others require, as necessary to be believ'd; and yet he himself gives not a Catalogue of his own Fundamentals,

damentals, which he will say is sufficient and compleat. Nor is it to be wonder'd, since in this Way it is impossible to stop short of putting every Proposition, divinely reveal'd, into the List of Fundamentals; all of them being of divine, and so of equal Authority; and upon that Account equally necessary to be believed, to make any one a Christian. For the New Testament, containing the Laws of the *Messiah's* Kingdom, in regard of all the Actions, both of Mind and Body, of all his Subjects; every Christian is bound, by his Allegiance to him, to believe all that he says in it to be true, as well as to assent, that all that he commands in it is just and good: And what Negligence, Perverseness, or Guilt there is, in his mistaking in the one, or failing in his Obedience to the other, that, this righteous Judge of all Men, who cannot be deceived, will at the last Day lay open, and reward accordingly.

'Tis no wonder therefore there have been such fierce Contests, and such cruel Havock made amongst Christians, about Fundamentals; whilst every one would set up his System, upon pain of Fire and Faggot in this, and Hell-fire in the other World: Though at the same Time, whilst he is exercising the utmost Barbarities against others, to prove himself a true Christian, he professes himself so ignorant that he

cannot tell, or so uncharitable that he will not tell, what Articles are absolutely necessary and sufficient to make a Man a Christian. If there be any such Fundamentals, as 'tis certain there are, 'tis as certain they must be very plain. Why then does every one urge, and make a stir about Fundamentals, and no body give a List of them; but because (as I have said) upon the usual Grounds, they cannot? For I will be bold to say, that every one, who considers the Matter, will see, that either only the Article, of his being the *Messiah* their King, which alone our Saviour and his Apostles preached to the unconverted World, and received those that believed it into the Church, is the only necessary Article to be believed by a *Theist*, to make him a Christian; or else that all the Truths, contained in the New Testament, are necessary Articles to be believed, to make a Man a Christian; and that between these two it is impossible any where to stand: The Reason whereof is plain; because either the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, *i. e.* the taking him to be our King, makes us Subjects and Denizens of his Kingdom, that is, Christians; or else an explicit Knowledge of, and actual Obedience to the Laws of his Kingdom, is what is requir'd to make us Subjects; which, I think, is what was never said of any other Kingdom:

dom : For a Man must be a Subject, before he is bound to obey.

Let us suppose it will be said here, that an Obedience to the Laws of Christ's Kingdom is what is necessary to make us Subjects of it ; without which we cannot be admitted into it, *i. e.* be Christians : And if so, this Obedience must be universal ; I mean, it must be the same Sort of Obedience to all the Laws of this Kingdom : Which, since no body says is in any one, such as is wholly free from Error or Frailty, this Obedience can only lie in a sincere Disposition and Purpose of Mind to obey every one of the Laws of the *Messiah* deliver'd in the New Testament, to the utmost of our Power. Now Believing right being one Part of that Obedience, as well as Acting right is the other Part, the Obedience of Assent must be implicitly to all that is deliver'd there, that it is true. But for as much as the particular Acts of an explicit Assent cannot go any farther than his Understanding, who is to assent ; what he understands to be the Truth deliver'd by our Saviour, or the Apostles commission'd by him, and assisted by his Spirit, That he must necessarily believe : It becomes a Fundamental Article to him, and he cannot refuse his Assent to it, without renouncing his Allegiance. For he that denies any of the Doctrines which Christ

has delivered, to be true, denies him to be sent from God, and consequently to be the Messiah; and so ceases to be a Christian. From whence it is evident, that if any more be necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, than the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, and thereby taking him for our King, it cannot be any set Bundle of Fundamentals cull'd out of the Scripture, with an Omission of the rest, according as best suits any one's Fancy, System, or Interest; but it must be an explicit Belief of all those Propositions, which he, according to the best of his Understanding, really apprehends to be contain'd, and meant in the Scripture; and an implicit Belief of all the rest, which he is ready to believe, as soon as it shall please God, upon his Use of the Means, to enlighten him, and make them clear to his Understanding. So that in effect almost every particular Man, in this Sense, has, or may have, a distinct Catalogue of Fundamentals, each whereof it is necessary for him explicitly to believe, now that he is a Christian; whereof if he should disbelieve, or deny any one, he would cast off his Allegiance, disfranchise himself, and be no longer a Subject of Christ's Kingdom. But in this Sense no body can tell what is Fundamental to another, what is necessary for another Man to believe. This Catalogue
of

of Fundamentals every one alone can make for himself: No body can fix it for him, no body can collect or prescribe it to another: But this is according as God has dealt to every one the Measure of Light and Faith; and has open'd each Man's Understanding, that he may understand the Scriptures. Whoever has us'd what Means he is capable of, for the informing of himself, with a Readiness to believe and obey what shall be taught and prescrib'd by *Jesus* his Lord and King, is a true and faithful Subject of *Christ's* Kingdom; and cannot be thought to fail in any thing necessary to Salvation.

Supposing a Man and his Wife, barely by seeing the wonderful Things that *Moses* did, should have been persuaded to put themselves under his Government; or by reading his Law, and liking it; or by any other Motive, had been prevailed on sincerely to take him for their Ruler and Law-giver; and accordingly (renouncing their former Idolatry, and Heathenish Pollutions) in token thereof had, by Baptism and Circumcision, the initiating Ceremonies, solemnly enter'd themselves into that Communion under the Law of *Moses*: Had they not thereby been made Denizens of the Common-wealth of *Israel*, and invested with all the Privileges and Prerogatives of true Children of *Abraham*; leaving to their

Posterity a Right to their Share in the promis'd Land, though they had died before they had performed any other Act of Obedience to that Law? nay, though they had not known whose Son *Moses* was, nor how he had deliver'd the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, nor whither he was leading them? I do not say, it is likely they should be so far ignorant: But whether they were or no, 'twas enough that they took him for their Prince and Ruler, with a Purpose to obey him, to submit themselves entirely to his Commands and Conduct; and did nothing afterwards, whereby they disown'd or rejected his Authority over them. In that Respect none of his Laws were greater, or more necessary to be submitted to, one than another; though the Matter of one might be of much greater Consequence than of another. But a Disobedience to any Law of the least Consequence, if it carry with it a Disowning of the Authority that made it, forfeits all, and cuts off such an Offender from that Commonwealth, and all the Privileges of it.

This is the Case in respect of other Matters of Faith, to those who believe *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, and take him to be their King sent from God, and so are already *Christians*. 'Tis not the Opinion, that any one may have of the Weightiness of the Matter (if they are, without their own Fault,

Fault, ignorant that our Saviour hath revealed it) that shall disfranchise them, and make them forfeit their Interest in his Kingdom: They may still be good Subjects, though they do not believe a great many Things, which Creed-makers may think necessary to be believed. That which is required of them, is a sincere Endeavour to know his Mind declared in the Gospel, and an explicit Belief of all that they understand to be so. Not to believe what he has revealed, whether in a lighter or more weighty Matter, calls his Veracity into Question, destroys his Mission, denies his Authority, and is a flat disowning him to be the *Messiah*, and so overturns that Fundamental and Necessary Article, whereby a Man is a Christian. But this cannot be done by a Man's Ignorance, or unwilful Mistake of any of the Truths published by our Saviour himself, or his authorized and inspired Ministers in the New Testament. Whilst a Man knows not that it was his Will or Meaning, his Allegiance is safe, though he believe the contrary.

If this were not so, it is impossible that any one should be a Christian. For in some Things we are ignorant, and err all, not knowing the Scriptures. For the holy inspired Writings, being all of the same divine Authority, must all equally, in every Article, be fundamental, and necessary to
be

be believed ; if that be a Reason that makes any one Proposition in it necessary to be believed. But the Law of Faith, the Covenant of the Gospel, being a Covenant of Grace, and not of natural Right or Debt ; nothing can be absolutely necessary to be believed, but what, by this new Law of Faith, God of his good Pleasure hath made to be so. And this, 'tis plain, by the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, to all that believed not already in him, was only the believing the only true God, and *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, whom he hath sent. The Performance of this puts a Man within the Covenant, and is that which God will impute to him for Righteousness. All the other Acts of Assent to other Truths, taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, are not what make a Man a Christian ; but are necessary Acts of Obedience to be performed by one who is a Christian, and therefore being a Christian, ought to live by the Laws of Christ's Kingdom.

Nor are we without some Glimpse of Light, why it hath pleased God, of his Grace, that the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, should be that Faith which he would impute to Men for Righteousness. 'Tis evident from Scripture, that our Saviour despised the Shame, and endured the Cross, for the Joy set before him ; which Joy, 'tis also plain, was a Kingdom. But
in

in this Kingdom, which his Father had appointed to him, he could have none but voluntary Subjects; such as leaving the Kingdom of Darkneſs, and of the Prince of this World, with all the Pleaſures, Poms and Vanities thereof, would put themſelves under his Dominion, and tranſlate themſelves into his Kingdom: Which they did by believing and owning him to be the *Meſſiah* their King, and thereby taking him to rule over them. For the Faith for which God juſtifieth, is not an empty Speculation, but a Faith join'd with Repentance, and working by Love. And for this, which was in effect to turn to God himſelf, and to their natural Allegiance due to him, and to advance as much as lay in them the Glory of the Kingdom which he had promiſed his Son, God was pleaſed to declare he would accept them, receive them to Grace, and blot out all their former Tranſgreſſions.

This is evidently the Covenant of Grace, as deliver'd in the Scriptures: And if this be not, I deſire any one to tell me what it is, and what are the Terms of it. 'Tis a Law of Faith, whereby God has promiſed to forgive all our Sins upon our Repentance, and believing ſomething; and to impute that Faith to us for Righteouſneſs. Now I aſk, what it is, by the Law of Faith, we are required to believe? For
till

till that be known, the Law of Faith is not distinctly known, nor the Terms of the Covenant upon which the All-merciful God graciously offers us Salvation. And if any one will say this is not known, nay, is not easily and certainly to be known under the Gospel, I desire him to tell me what the greatest Enemies of Christianity can say worse against it? For a Way propos'd to Salvation, that does not certainly lead thither, or is propos'd so as not to be known, are very little different as to their Consequence; and Mankind would be left to wander in Darkness and Uncertainty with the one, as well as the other.

I do not write this for Controversy-sake; for had I minded Victory, I would not have given the *Unmasker* this new Matter of Exception. I know, whatever is said, he must be bawling for his fashionable and profitable Orthodoxy; and cry out against this too, which I have here added, as *Socinianism*, and cast that Name upon all that differs from what is held by those he would recommend his Zeal to in Writing. I call it *Bawling*; for whether what he has said be Reasoning, I shall refer to those of his own Brotherhood, if he be of any Brotherhood, and there be any that will join with him in his Set of Fundamentals, when his Creed is made.

Had

Had I minded nothing but how to deal with him, I had tied him up short to his List of Fundamentals, without affording him Topicks of declaiming against what I have here said. But I have enlarged on this Point, for the sake of such Readers, who with a Love of Truth read Books of this kind, and endeavour to inform themselves in the Things of their everlasting Concernment: It being of greater Consideration with me, to give any Light and Satisfaction to one single Person, who is really concerned to understand and be convinced of the Religion he professes, than what a thousand fashionable or titular Professors of any Sort of Orthodoxy shall say or think of me, for not doing as they do; *i. e.* for not saying after others, without understanding what is said, or upon what Grounds, or caring to understand it.

Let us now consider his Argument, to prove the Articles he has given us to be Fundamentals. In his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 119. he argues from 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. where he says, *Christianity is called a Mystery; that all Things in Christianity are not plain, and exactly level to every common Apprehension; that every Thing in Christianity is not clear and intelligible, and comprehensible by the weakest Noddle.* Let us take this for proved, as
much

much as he pleases; and then let us see the Force of this subtle Disputant's Argument, for the Necessity there is, that every Christian Man should believe those, which he has given us for Fundamental Articles, out of the *Epistles*. The Reason of that Obligation, and the Necessity of every Man and Woman's believing them, he has laid in this, that they are to be found in the *Epistles*, or in the *Bible*. This Argument for them, we have over and over again, in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, is here, p. 9. thus: *Are they set down to no Purpose, in these inspired Epistles? Why did the Apostles write these Doctrines; was it not that those, they writ to, might give their Assent to them?* p. 22. *They are in our Bibles for that very Purpose, to be believed;* p. 25. Now I ask, Can any one more directly invalidate all he says here, for the Necessity of believing his Articles? Can any one more apparently write Booty, than by saying that *these his Doctrines, these his Fundamental Articles* (which are after his Fashion set down, between the 8th and 20th Pages of this his first Chapter) are of necessity to be believed by every one, before he can be a Christian, because they are in the *Epistles*, and in the *Bible*; and yet affirm that in Christianity, *i. e.* in the *Epistles*, and in the *Bible*, there are *Mysteries*, there are Things *not plain, not clear, nor intelligible*

to

to common Apprehensions? If his Articles, some of which contain Myſteries, are neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, becauſe they are in the Bible; then, according to this Rule, it is neceſſary for many Men to believe what is not *intelligible* to them; what their *Noddles* cannot apprehend (as the *Unmasker* is pleaſed to turn the Suppoſition, of vulgar Peoples underſtanding the Fundamentals of their Religion, into Ridicule) *i. e.* it is neceſſary for many Men to do what is impoſſible for them to do, before they can be Chriſtians. But if there be ſeveral Things in the Bible, and in the *Epistles*, that it is not neceſſary for Men to believe, to make them Chriſtians; then all the *Unmasker's* Arguments upon their being in the *Epistles*, is no Proof that all his Articles are neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, becauſe they are ſet down in the *Epistles*: Much leſs becauſe he thinks they may be drawn, according to his System, out of what is ſet down in the *Epistles*. Let him therefore either confeſs theſe, or the like Questions, *Why did the Apoſtles write theſe? was it not, that thoſe they writ to, might give their Aſſent to them? Why ſhould not every one of theſe Evangelical Truths be believed and embraced? They are in our Bibles for that very Purpoſe*—and the like, to be impertinent and

ridiculous: Let him cease to propose them with so much Ostentation, for they can serve only to mislead unwary Readers: Or let him unsay what he has said of Things *not plain to common Apprehensions, not clear and intelligible*: Let him recant what he has said of *Mysteries* in Christianity: For I ask with him, *p. 8. where can we be informed, but in the sacred and inspired Writings?* It is ridiculous to urge, that any thing is necessary to be explicitly believed to make a Man a Christian, because it is writ in the *Epistles*, and in the *Bible*; unless he confess that there is no *Mystery*, nothing *not plain nor intelligible* to vulgar Understanding, in the *Epistles* or in the *Bible*.

This is so evident, that the *Unmasker* himself, who, *p. 119.* of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, thought it ridiculous to suppose that the Vulgar should understand Christianity, is here of another Mind; and *p. 30.* says, of his Evangelical Doctrines and Articles necessary to be assented to, that they are *intelligible and plain*; there is no *Ambiguity and Doubtfulness in them*; *they shine with their own Light, and to an unprejudic'd Eye are plain, evident, and illustrious.*

To draw the *Unmasker* out of the Clouds, and prevent his hiding himself in the Doubtfulness of his Expressions, I shall
desire

desire him to say directly whether the Articles, which are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, and particularly those he has set down for such, are all plain and intelligible, and such as may be understood and comprehended (I will not say in the *Unmasker's* ridiculous Way, by the *weakest Noddles*, but) by every illiterate Countryman and Woman, capable of Church-Communion?

If he says yes; then all Mysteries are excluded out of his Articles, necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian. For that which can be comprehended by every Day-Labourer, every poor Spinster, that is a Member of the Church, cannot be a Mystery. And if what such illiterate People cannot understand, be required to be believed to make them Christians, the greatest Part of Mankind are shut out from being Christians.

But the *Unmasker* has provided an Answer, in these Words, p. 31. *There is*, says he, *a Difficulty in the Doctrine of the Trinity, and several Truths of the Gospel, as to the exact Manner of the Things themselves, which we shall never be able to comprehend, at least on this side of Heaven: But there is no Difficulty as to the Reality and Certainty of them, because we know they are revealed to us by God in the Holy Scriptures.*

G

Which

Which Answer, of *Difficulty in the Manner*, and no *Difficulty in the Reality*, having the Appearance of a Distinction, looks like Learning; but when it comes to be applied to the Case in hand, will scarce afford us Sense.

The Question is about a Proposition to be believed, which must first necessarily be understood. For a Man cannot possibly give his Assent to any Affirmation or Negation, unless he understand the Terms as they are join'd in that Proposition, and has a Conception of the Thing affirm'd or deny'd; and also a Conception of the Thing concerning which it is affirmed or denied, as they are there put together. But let the Proposition be what it will, there is no more to be understood than is expressed in the Terms of that Proposition. If it be a Proposition concerning a Matter of Fact, 'tis enough to conceive, and believe the Matter of Fact. If it be a Proposition concerning the Manner of the Fact, the Manner of the Fact must also be believed, as 'tis intelligibly expressed in that Proposition: *v. g.* Should this Proposition, *νενεξι ἐντελογίας*, be offer'd as an Article of Faith to an illiterate Countryman of *England*, he could not believe it; because, though a true Proposition, yet it being propos'd in Words whose Meaning he understood not, he could not give any Assent

lieved, as far as it is understood: But no more is required to be believed, concerning any Article, than is contained in that Article.

What the *Unmasker*, for the removing of Difficulties, adds farther in these Words, *But there is no Difficulty as to the Reality and Certainty of the Truths of the Gospel, because we know they are revealed to us by God in the holy Scripture*, is yet farther from signifying any thing to the Purpose than the former. The Question is about understanding, and, in what Sense they are understood, believing several Propositions, or Articles of Faith, which are to be found in the Scripture. To this the *Unmasker* says, there can be *no Difficulty at all as to their Reality and Certainty, because they are revealed by God*. Which amounts to no more than this; that there is no Difficulty at all in the understanding and believing this Proposition, *that whatever is revealed by God is really and certainly true*. But is the understanding and believing this single Proposition, the understanding and believing all the Articles of Faith necessary to be believed? Is this all the explicit Faith a Christian need have? If so, then a Christian need explicitly believe no more but this one Proposition, *viz. That all the Propositions between the two Covers of his Bible, are certainly true*. But I imagine the *Unmasker* will
not

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 85

not think the believing this one Proposition is a sufficient Belief of all those Fundamental Articles, which he has given us as necessary to be believed, to make a Man a Christian. For if that will serve the Turn, I conclude he may make his Set of Fundamentals as large and express to his System as he pleases: *Calvinists, Arminians, Anabaptists, Socinians*, will all thus own the Belief of them, *viz.* That all that God has revealed in the Scripture is really and certainly true.

But if believing this Proposition, that all that is revealed by God in the Scripture is true, be not all the Faith which the *Unmasker* requires, what he says about the *Reality* and *Certainty* of all Truths revealed by God, removes nothing of the Difficulty. A Proposition of divine Authority is found in the Scripture: 'Tis agreed presently, between him and me, that it contains a *real, certain* Truth: But the Difficulty is, what is the Truth it contains, to which he and I must assent? *v. g.* The Profession of Faith made by the Eunuch in these Words, *Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, upon which he was admitted into the Church as a Christian, I believe contains a *real and certain* Truth. Is that enough? No, says the *Unmasker*, p. 87. it includes in it that *Christ was God*; and therefore it is not enough for me to

believe, that these Words contain a *real, certain* Truth: But I must believe they contain this Truth, that Jesus Christ is God; that the Eunuch spoke them in that Sense, and in that Sense I must assent to them: Whereas they appear to me to be spoken, and meant here, as well as in several other Places of the *New Testament*, in this Sense, *viz. That Jesus Christ is the Messiah*; and in that Sense in this Place I assent to them. The Meaning then of these Words, as spoken by the Eunuch, is the Difficulty: And I desire the *Unmasker*, by the Application of what he has said here, to remove that Difficulty. For granting all Revelation from God to be *really* and *certainly* true (as certainly it is) how does the believing that general Truth remove any Difficulty about the Sense and Interpretation of any particular Proposition, found in any Passage of the Holy Scriptures? Or is it possible for any Man to understand it in one Sense, and believe it in another; because it is a divine Revelation, that has *Reality* and *Certainty* in it? Thus much as to what the *Unmasker* says, of the Fundamentals he has given us, *p. 30. viz. That no true Lover of God and Truth need doubt of any of them; for there is no Ambiguity and Doubtfulness in them.* If the Distinction he has used of *Difficulty* as *to the exact Manner*, and no *Difficulty* as *to the*

the Reality and Certain'y of Gospel-Truths, will remove all *Ambiguity and Doubtfulness* from all those Texts of Scripture, from whence he and others deduce Fundamental Articles, so that they will be *plain and intelligible* to every Man in the Sense he understands them, he has done great Service to Christianity.

But he seems to distrust that himself, in the following Words: *They shine,* says he, *with their own Light, and to an unprejudic'd Eye are plain, evident, and illustrious; and they would always continue so, if some ill-minded Men did not perplex and entangle them.* I see the Matter would go very smooth, if the *Unmasker* might be the sole authentick Interpreter of Scripture. He is wisely of that Judge's Mind, who was against hearing the Counsel on the other Side, because they always *perplexed* the Cause.

But if those who differ from the *Unmasker* shall, in their Turns, call him the *Prejudic'd and Ill-minded Man,* who *perplexes* these Matters (as they may with as much Authority as he) we are but where we were; each must understand for himself the best he can, till the *Unmasker* be received as the only *unprejudic'd Man,* to whose Dictates every one, without Examination, is with an implicit Faith to submit.

Here again, p. 32. the *Unmasker* puts upon me what I never said : And therefore I must desire him to shew, where it is, that I pretend,

XI. That this *Proposition*; that Jesus is the Messiah, *is more intelligible than any of those he has named?*

In his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 120. he argues, that this Proposition [*Jesus is the Messiah*] has more Difficulty in it than the Article of the Holy Trinity. And his Proofs are worthy of an *Unmasker* : For, says he, *here is an Hebrew Word first to be explain'd*; or (as he has this strong Argument again, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 32.) *Here first the Name Jesus, which is of Hebrew Extraction, though since Grecis'd, must be expounded.*

Ans^w. *Jesus* being a Proper Name, only denoting a certain Person, needs not to be expounded, of what *Extraction* soever it be. Is this Proposition, *Jonatban* was the Son of *Saul* King of *Israel*, any thing the harder, because the three Proper Names in it, *Jonathan*, *Saul* and *Israel*, are of *Hebrew Extraction*? And is it not as easy, and as level to the Understanding of the *Vulgar*, as this, *Arthur* was the Son of *Henry* King of *England*, though neither of these Names be of *Hebrew Extraction*? Or
cannot

cannot any *vulgar Capacity* understand this Proposition, *John Edwards writ a Book, intitled, Socinianism Unmask'd*, till the Name *John*, which is of *Hebrew Extraction*, be explained to him? If this be so, Parents were best beware how hereafter they give their Children Scripture-Names, if they cannot understand what they say to one another about them, till these Names of *Hebrew Extraction* are expounded to them; and every Proposition, that is in Writings and Contracts made concerning Persons, that have Names of *Hebrew Extraction*, become thereby as hard to be understood as the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

His next Argument is just of the same Size. The Word *Messias* must, he says, be explained too. Of what *Extraction* soever it be, there needs no more Explication of it than what our *English Bible* gives of it; where it is plain, to any *vulgar Capacity*, that it was used to denote that King and Deliverer whom God had promised. So that this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messiah*, has no more Difficulty in it than this, *Jesus is the promised King and Deliverer*; or than this, *Cyrus was King and Deliverer of Persia*: Which, I think, requires not much Depth of *Hebrew* to be understood. He that understood this Proposition, and took *Cyrus* for his King, was

a Subject and a Member of his Kingdom ; and he that understands the other, and takes *Jesus* to be his King, is his Subject, and a Member of his Kingdom. But if this be as hard as it is to some Men to understand the Doctrine of the Trinity, I fear many of the Kings in the World have but few true Subjects. To believe *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, is (as he has been told over and over again) to take him for our King and Ruler, promised and sent by God. This is that which will make any one, from a *Jew* or *Heathen*, to be a *Christian*. In this Sense it is very intelligible to *vulgar Capacities*. Those who so understand and believe it, are so far from *pronouncing these Words as a Spell* (as the *Unmasker* ridiculously suggests, *p.* 33.) that they therefore become Christians.

But what if I tell the *Unmasker* that there is one *Mr. Edwards*, who (when he speaks his Mind, without considering how it will make for or against him) in another Place, thinks this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messiah*, very easy and intelligible? To convince him of it, I shall desire him to turn to the 74th Page of his *Socinianism Unmask'd* ; where he will find that *Mr. Edwards*, without any great Search into the *Hebrew Extractions*, interprets *Jesus the Messiah* to signify this, *That Jesus of Nazareth was that eminent and extraordinary Person*

Person prophesied of long before, and that he was sent and commissioned by God: Which, I think, is no very hard Proposition to be understood. But it is no strange thing, that that which was very easy to an Unmasker in one Place, should be terrible hard in another; where want of something better requires to have it so.

Another Argument that he uses to prove the Articles he has given us to be necessary to Salvation (*p. 22.*) is, because they are Doctrines which contain Things that in their Nature have an *immediate Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, End, Means and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation.* And here I desire him to prove,

XII. That every one of his Articles contain Things so immediately relating to the *Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of our Redemption and Salvation*, that no body can be sav'd without understanding the Texts from whence he draws them, in the very same Sense that he does; and explicitly believing all these Propositions that he has deduced, and all that he will deduce from Scripture, when he shall please to compleat his Creed,

Page 23. he says of his Fundamentals, Not without good Reason THEREFORE
I

I call'd them Essential and Integral Parts of our Christian and Evangelical Faith: And why the Vindicator fleers at these Terms, p. 275. I know no Reason; but that he cannot confute the Application of them.

Answ. One would think by the Word *Therefore*, which he uses here, that in the precedent Paragraph he had produc'd some Reason to justify his ridiculous Use of those Terms, in his *Thoughts concerning Atheism*, p. 111. But nothing therein will be found tending to it. Indeed the foregoing Paragraph begins with these Words: *Thus I have briefly set before the Reader those Evangelical Truths, those Christian Principles, which belong to the very Essence of Christianity.* Amongst these there is the Word *Essence*: But that from thence, or any thing else in that Paragraph, the *Unmasker* could with good Sense, or any Sense at all, infer as he does, *Not without good Reason THEREFORE I called them the ESSENTIAL and INTEGRAL Parts of our Christian and Evangelical Faith*, requires an extraordinary Sort of Logick to make out. What, I beseech you, is your *good Reason* too here, upon which you inter *Therefore*, &c? For it is impossible for any one, but an *Unmasker*, to find one Word justifying his Use of the Terms *Essential* and *Integral*. But it
would

would be a great Restraint to the running of the *Unmasker's* Pen, if you should not allow him the free Use of illative Particles, where there are no Premises to support them: And if you should not take Affirmations without Proof for Reasoning, you at once strike off above three quarters of his Book; and he will often, for several Pages together, have nothing to say. As for Example, from p. 28. to p. 35.

But to shew that I did not without reason say his Use of the Terms, *Essential* and *Integral*, in the Place before quoted, was ridiculous; I must mind my Reader, that, p. 109. of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, he having said, that *the Epistolary Writings are fraught with other Fundamentals besides that one which I mention*; and then having set them down, he closes his Catalogue of them thus: *These are Matters of Faith contained in the Epistles, and they are Essential and Integral Parts of the Gospel it self*, p. 111. Now what could be more ridiculous, than where the Question is about Fundamental Doctrines, which are the *Essentials* of Christian Religion, without an Assent to which a Man cannot be a Christian (and so he himself calls them, p. 21. of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*) that he should close the List he had made of *Fundamental Doctrines*, i. e. Essential Points of the Christian Religion,

gion, with telling his Reader, *These are Essential and Integral Parts of the Gospel it self?* i. e. These, which I have given you for *Fundamental*, for *Essential* Doctrines of the Gospel, are the *Fundamental* and not *Fundamental*, *Essential* and not *Essential* Parts of the Gospel mix'd together: For *Integral* Parts, in all the Writers I have met with besides the *Unmasker*, are contra-distinguish'd to *Essential*; and signify such Parts as the Thing can be without, but without them will not be so compleat and intire as with them. Just such an Acuteness as our *Unmasker* would any one shew, who taking upon him to set down the Parts *Essential* to a Man, without the having of which he could not be a Man, should name the Soul, the Head, the Heart, Lungs, Stomach, Liver, Spleen, Eyes, Ears, Tongue, Arms, Legs, Hair and Nails; and to make all sure, should conclude with these Words; *These are Parts contained in a Man, and are Essential and Integral Parts of a Man himself*; i. e. They are Parts, without some of which he cannot be a Man; and others, which though they make the Man intire, yet he may be a Man without them: As a Man ceases not to be a Man, though he want a Nail, a Finger, or an Arm, which are *Integral Parts* of a Man. *Risum tenetis?* If the *Unmasker* can make any better

better Sense of his *Essential and Integral Parts of the Gospel it self*, I will ask his Pardon for my Laughing: Till then he must not be angry, if the Reader and I laugh too. Besides, I must tell him, that those which he has set down are not the *Integral Parts of the Christian Faith*, any more than the Head, the Trunk, and the Arms, Hands and Thighs, are the *Integral Parts of a Man*: For a Man is not intire, without the Legs and Feet too. They are some of the *Integral Parts* indeed; but cannot be call'd the *Integral Parts*, where any that go to make up the whole Man are left out: Nor those the *Integral*, but some of the *Integral Parts* of the Christian Faith, out of which any of the Doctrines propos'd in the *New Testament* are omitted: For whatever is there propos'd, is propos'd to be believ'd, and so is a Part of the Christian Faith.

Before I leave his Catalogue of the *Essential and Integral Parts* of the Gospel, which he has given us, instead of one containing the Articles necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, I must take notice of what he says whilst he is making it, p. 9. *Why then is there a Treatise publish'd, to tell the World that the bare Belief of a Messiah is all that is required of a Christian?* As if there were no Difference between believing a *Messiah*, and believing
Jesus

96 *A Second Vindication of the*
Jesus to be the Messiah; no Difference be-
tween *requir'd of a Christian*, and *requir'd*
to make a Man a Christian. As if you
should say, renouncing his former Ido-
latry, and being circumcised and baptized
into *Moses*, was all that was required to
make a Man an *Israelite*; therefore it was
all that was required of an *Israelite*. For
these two Falshoods has he, in this one
short Sentence, thought fit silyly to father
upon me, the *bumble Imitator of the Je-*
suits, as he is pleas'd to call me. And
therefore I must desire him to shew,

XIII. Where the *World is told, in the*
Treatise that I publish'd, That the
bare Belief of a Messiah is all that is
requir'd of a Christian?

The six next Pages, *i. e.* from the twen-
ty-eighth to the End of his Second Chapter,
being taken up with nothing but Pulpit-
Oratory out of its Place, and without any
Reply apply'd or applicable to any Thing
I have said in my *Vindication*, I shall pass
by, till he shews any Thing in them that
is so.

In *Page 36.* this Giant in Argument
falls on me, and mauls me unmercifully
about the Epistles. He begins thus: *The*
Gentleman is not without his Evasions, and
he sees it is high time to make use of them.
This

This puts him in some Disorder. For when he comes to speak of my mentioning his ill Treatment of the Epistles—you may observe that he begins to grow warmer than before. Now this meek Man is nettled, and one may perceive he is sensible of the Scandal that he hath given to good People, by his slighting the epistolary Writings of the Holy Apostles; yet he is so cunning, as to disguise his Passion as well as he can. Let all this impertinent and inconsistent Stuff be so. I am angry, and cannot disguise it; I am *cunning*, and would disguise it; but yet the quick-sighted *Unmasker* has found me out, that I am *nettled*. What does all this notable Prologue of *Hic tuius Doctius*, of a *Cunning Man*, and in effect *no Cunning Man*, in *Disorder*, *warm'd*, *nettled*, in a *Passion*, tend to, but to shew that these following Words of mine, *p. 276.* of my *Vindication*, viz. “ I require you to publish to the “ World those Passages which shew my “ Contempt of the Epistles,” are so full of Heat and Disorder, that they need no other Answer? But *what need I, good Sir, do this, when you have done it your self?* A Reply, I own, very soft; and whether I may not say very filly, let the Reader judge. The *Unmasker* having accused me of contemning the Epistles, my Reply, in my *Vindication*, *ibid.* was thus: ‘ Sir, ‘ when your angry Fit is over, and the

H

‘ Abate-

‘ Abatement of your Passion has given
 ‘ way to the Return of your Sincerity,
 ‘ I shall beg you to read this Passage in
 ‘ the 253d Page of my Book. “ These
 “ holy Writers (*viz.* the Penmen of the
 “ Epistles) inspired from above, writ no-
 “ thing but Truth; and in most Places
 “ very weighty Truths to us now, for the
 “ expounding, clearing, and confirming
 “ of the Christian Doctrine, and establish-
 “ ing those in it who had embraced it.
 “ And again, *p.* 255. The other Parts [*i. e.*
 “ besides the Gospels and the *Acts*] of
 “ *DIVINE REVELATION* are
 “ Objects of Faith, and are so to be re-
 “ ceived: They are Truths, of which
 “ none that is once known to be such,
 “ *i. e.* revealed, may, or ought to be dis-
 “ believed.” ‘ And if this does not satisfy
 ‘ you, that I have as high a Veneration
 ‘ for the Epistles as you or any one can
 ‘ have, I require you to publish to the
 ‘ World those *PASSAGES* which shew
 ‘ my Contempt of them.’ After such
 direct Words of mine, expressing my Ve-
 neration for that Part of divine Revelation
 which is contained in the Epistles, any
 one but an *Unmasker* would blush to charge
 me with *Contempt* of them; without al-
 leging, when summon’d to it, any Word
 in my Book to justify that Charge.

If

If Hardness of Forehead were Strength of Brains, 'twere two to one of his Side against any Man I ever yet heard of. I require him to publish to the World those *Passages* that shew my *Contempt* of the Epistles; and he answers me, *He need not do it, for I have done it my self.* Whoever had common Sense would understand that what I demanded was that he should shew the World where, amongst all I had published, there were any *Passages* that express'd *Contempt* of the Epistles: For it was not expected he should quote *Passages* of mine, that I had never publish'd. And this acute *Unmasker* (to this) says, I had publish'd them my self. So that the Reason why he cannot find them, is, because I had publish'd them my self. But, says he, *I appeal to the Reader, whether (after your tedious Collection out of the four Evangelists) your passing by the Epistles, and neglecting wholly what the Apostles say in them, be not publishing to the World your Contempt of them?* I demand of him to publish to the World those *Passages*, which shew my *Contempt* of the Epistles: And he answers, *He need not, I have done it my self.* How does that appear? I have pass'd by the Epistles, says he. My passing them by then, are *Passages* publish'd against the Epistles? For *publishing of Passages* is what you said you need not do, and what

I had done. So that the *Passages* I have publish'd, containing a Contempt of the Epistles, are extant in my saying nothing of them. Surely this same *passing by* has done some very shrewd Displeasure to our poor *Unmasker*, that he so starts whenever it is but nam'd, and cannot think it contains less than *Exclusion, Defiance, and Contempt.* Here therefore the Proposition remaining to be prov'd by you is,



XIV. *That one cannot pass by any thing without Contempt of it.*

And when you have prov'd it, I shall then ask you, what will become of all those Parts of Scripture, all those Chapters and Verses that you have *pass'd by*, in your Collection of Fundamental Articles? Those that you have vouchsafed to set down, you tell us *are in the Bible, on purpose to be believed.* What must become of all the rest, which you have omitted? Are they there not to be believ'd? And must the *Reader* understand your *passing them by* to be a publishing to the World your *Contempt* of them? If so, you have *unmask'd* your self: If not, but you may *pass by* some Parts of Scripture, nay whole Epistles, as you have those of St. *James* and St. *Jude*, without *Contempt*; why may not I, without *Contempt*, pass by others; but

but because you have a Liberty to do what you will, and I must do but what you, in your good Pleasure, will allow me? But if I ask you whence you have this Privilege above others, you will have nothing to say; except it be, according to your usual Skill in Divining, that you know my Heart, and the Thoughts that are in it, which you find not like yours, right, and orthodox, and good; but always evil and perverse, such as I dare not own, but hypocritically either say nothing of, or declare against: But yet, with all my Cunning, I cannot hide them from you; your all-knowing Penetration always finds them out; you know them, or you guess at them, as is best for your Turn, and that's as good; and then presently I am confounded. I doubt whether the World has ever had any two-ey'd Man your Equal, for Penetration and a quick Sight. The telling, by the Spectator's Looks, what Card he guesses, is nothing to what you can do. You take the Height of an Author's Parts, by numbring the Pages of his Book; you can spy an Heresy in him, by his saying not a Syllable of it; distinguish him from the Orthodox, by his understanding Places of Scripture just as several of the Orthodox do; you can repeat by heart whole Leaves of what is in his Mind to say, before he speaks a Word of it; you

can discover Designs before they are hatch'd, and all the Intrigues of carrying them on by those who never thought of them. All this, and more you can do, by the Spirit of Orthodoxy; or, which is as certain, by your own good Spirit of Invention informing you. Is not this to be an errant Conjuror?

But to your Reply: You say, *After my TEDIOUS Collection out of the four Evangelists, my passing by the Epistles, and neglecting wholly what the Apostles say, &c.* I wonder'd at first why you mention'd not the *Acts* here, as well as the *four Evangelists*; for I have not (as you have in other Places observ'd) been sparing of Collections out of the *Acts* too. But there was, it seems, a Necessity here for your omitting it; for that would have stood too near what followed, in these Words: *And neglecting wholly what the Apostles say.* For if it appear'd to the Reader, out of your own Confession, that I allow'd and built upon the divine Authority of what the Apostles say in the *Acts*, he could not so easily be mis-led into an Opinion that I contemned what they say in their Epistles. But this is but a slight Touch of your Legerdemain.

And now I ask the Reader what he will think of a Minister of the Gospel, who cannot bear the Texts of Scripture I have pro-

produc'd, nor my Quotations out of the four Evangelists? This, which in his *Thoughts of the Causes of Atheism*, p. 114. was want of *Vivacity and Elevation of Mind*, want of *a Vein of Sense and Reason*, yea, and of *Elocution too*; is here, in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, a tedious Collection out of the four Evangelists. Those Places I have quoted, lie heavy it seems upon his Stomach, and are too many to be got off. But it was my Business not to omit one of them, that the Reader might have a full View of the whole Tenor of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles to the unconverted *Jews and Gentiles*; and might therein see what Faith they were converted to, and upon their Assent to which they were pronounced Believers, and admitted into the Christian Church. But the *Unmasker* complains there are too many of them: He thinks the Gospel, the good News of Salvation, tedious from the Mouth of our Saviour and his Apostles: He is of opinion, that before the Epistles were writ, and without believing precisely what he thinks fit to cull out of them, there could be no Christians; and if we had nothing but the four Evangelists, we could not be saved. And yet 'tis plain, that every single one of the Four contains the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*; and at least they, all together, contain all that is ne-

cessary to Salvation. If any one doubt of this, I refer him to Mr. *Chillingworth* for Satisfaction, who hath abundantly prov'd it.

His following Words (were he not the same *Unmasker* all through) would be beyond Parallel. *But let us hear why the Vindicator did not attempt to collect any Articles out of these Writings. He assigns this as one Reason: "The Epistles being* " writ to those who were already Be- " lievers, it could not be supposed that " they were writ to them to teach them " Fundamentals;" *Vindic. p. 271, 272. Certainly no Man would have conjectured that he would have used such an Evasion as this. I will say that for him, he goes beyond all Surmises, he is above all Conjectures; he hath a Faculty, which no Creature on Earth can ever fathom. Thus far the Unmasker, in his Oratorical Strain. In what follows, he comes to his closer Reasoning against what I had said. His Words are, Do we not know that the four Gospels were writ to and for Believers, as well as Unbelievers? Answ. I grant it. Now let us see your Inference: Therefore what these holy Historians recorded, that our Saviour and his Apostles said and preached to Unbelievers, was said and preached to Believers. The Discourse which our Saviour had with the Woman of Samaria, and her Townsmen, was address'd to Believers; because*

because St. *John* writ his Gospel (wherein it is recorded as a Part of our Saviour's History) for Believers, as well as Unbelievers. St. *Peter's* Preaching to *Cornelius*, and St. *Paul's* Preaching at *Antioch*, at *Thessalonica*, at *Corinth*, &c. was not to Unbelievers, for their Conversion; because St. *Luke* dedicates his History of the *Acts of the Apostles* to *Theophilus*, who was a Christian, as the *Unmasker* strenuously proves in this Paragraph. Just as if he should say, that the Discourses which *Cæsar* records he had upon several Occasions with the *Gauls*, were not address'd to the *Gauls* alone, but to the *Romans* also; because his Commentaries were writ for the *Romans*, as well as others: Or that the Sayings of the antient *Greeks* and *Romans* in *Plutarch*, were not spoke by them to their Contemporaries only, because they are recorded by him for the Benefit of Posterity.

I perus'd the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to the unconverted World, to see what they taught and required to be believed to make Men Christians: And all these I set down, and leave the World to judge what they contain'd. The Epistles, which were all written to those who had embraced the Faith, and were all Christians already, I thought would not so distinctly shew what were those Doctrines
which

which were absolutely necessary to make Men Christians; they being not writ to convert Unbelievers, but to build up those who were already Believers, in their most holy Faith. This is plainly express'd in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. v. 11, &c. *Of whom, i. e. Christ, we have many Things to say, and hard to be utter'd, seeing ye are all dull of hearing. For when for the Time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God; and are become such as have need of Milk, and not of strong Meat. For every one that useth Milk is unskilful in the Word of Righteousness; for he is a Babe: But strong Meat belongeth to him that is of full Age; even those who by reason of Use have their Senses exercised, to discern both good and bad. Therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto Perfection; not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works, and of Faith towards God, and of the Doctrine of Baptism, and of laying on of Hands, and of the Resurrection of the Dead, and of eternal Judgment. Here the Apostle shews what was his Design in writing this Epistle: Not to teach them the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion, but to lead them on to more Perfection; that is, to greater Degrees of Knowledge of the wise Design, and wonderful Contrivance*
and

and carrying on of the Gospel, and the Evidence of it; which he makes out in this Epistle, by shewing its Correspondence with the *Old Testament*, and particularly with the Oeconomy of the *Mosaical Constitution*. Here I might ask the *Unmasker*, Whether those many Things, which *St. Paul* tells the *Hebrews* he had to say of Christ (hard to be utter'd to them, because they were dull of hearing) had not an immediate Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, or Issue, of their Redemption and Salvation; and therefore, whether they were such Things, without the Knowledge of which they could not be saved? as the *Unmasker* says of such Things, p. 23. And the like I might ask him, concerning those Things which the Apostle tells the *Corinthians*, 1 Ep. Chap. iii. 2. that they were not able to bear. For much to the same Purpose he speaks to the *Corinthians*, 1 Ep. Chap. iii. as in the above-cited Places he did to the *Hebrews*; That he, as a wise Master-Builder, had laid the Foundation: And that Foundation he himself tells us is *Jesus the Messiah*; and that there is no other Foundation to be laid. And that in this he laid the Foundation of Christianity at *Corinth*, *St. Luke* records, *Acts* xviii. 4. in these Words: *Paul, at Corinth, reasoned in the Synagogue every Sabbath-day, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah.*

Messiah. Upon which Foundation he tells them there might be a Superstructure. But that what is built on the Foundation is not the Foundation, I think I need not prove. He farther tells them, that he had desired to build upon this Foundation; but withal says, he had *fed them* till then *with Milk, and not with Meat; because they were Babes, and had not been able to bear it, neither were they yet able.* And therefore this Epistle we see is almost wholly spent in Reproofs of their Miscarriages, and in Exhortations and Instructions relating to Practice; and very little said in it for the explaining any Part of the great *Mystery* of Salvation, contained in the Gospel.

By these Passages we may see (were it not evident to common Sense it self, from the Nature of Things) that the Design of these Epistles was not to lay the Foundations, or teach the Principles of the Christian Religion; they being writ to those who had received them, and were Christians already. The same holds in all the other Epistles: And therefore the Epistles seem'd not to me the properest Parts of Scripture to give us that Foundation distinct from all the Superstructures built on it; because, in the Epistles, the latter was the Thing proposed, rather than the former. For the main Intention of the Apostles,

stles, in writing their Epistles, could not be to do what was done already, to lay down barely the Foundation of Christianity to those who were Christians already; but to build upon it some farther Explanation of it, which either their particular Circumstances, or a general Evidencing of the Truth, Wisdom, Excellencies, and Privileges, &c. of the Gospel, requir'd. This was the Reason that persuaded me to take the Articles of Faith, absolutely necessary to be receiv'd to make a Man a Christian, only from the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to the unconverted World, as laid down in the historical Part of the New Testament; and I thought it a good Reason: It being past doubt, that they in their Preachings propos'd to the Unconverted all that was necessary to be believed to make them Christians: And also, that that Faith, upon a Profession whereof any one was admitted into the Church as a Believer, had all that was necessary in it to make him a Christian; because if it wanted any thing necessary, he had necessarily not been admitted: Unless we can suppose, that any one was admitted into the Christian Church by our Saviour, and his Apostles, who was not yet a Christian; or pronounced a Believer, who yet wanted something necessary to make him a Believer; *i. e.* was a Believer,

Believer, and not a Believer, at the same Time. But what those Articles were, which had been preach'd to those to whom the Epistles were writ, and upon the Belief whereof they had been admitted into the Christian Church, and became, as they are call'd, *Believers, Saints, Faithful, Elect, &c.* could not be collected out of the Epistles. This, though it were my Reason, and must be a Reason to every one who would make this Enquiry; and the *Unmasker* quotes the Place, where I told him it was my Reason; yet he, according to his never-erring Illumination, flatly tells me, *p. 38.* that it was not; and adds, *Here then is want of Sincerity, &c.* I must desire him therefore to prove what he says, *p. 38. viz.*

XV. *That by the same Argument that I would persuade that the Fundamentals are not to be sought for in the Epistles, he can prove that they are not to be sought for in the Gospels, and in the Acts; because even these were writ to those that believed.*

And next I desire him to prove, what he also says in the same Page, *viz.*

XVI. *That the Epistles being writ to those that believ'd, was not an Argument that I did make use of.*

He

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. III

He tells us, *p. 31.* That it is the Argument whereby I *would persuade*; and in the very same Page, a few Lines lower, says, *That it is not the Argument I did make use of.* Who, but an errant *Unmasker*, would contradict himself so flatly in the same Breath? And yet, upon that, he raises a Complaint of my *want of Sincerity.*

For *want of Sincerity* in one of us, we need not go far for an Instance. The next Paragraph, *p. 38—40.* affords us a gross one of it; wherein the *Unmasker* argues strongly, not against any thing I had said, but against an Untruth of his own setting up. Towards the latter end of the Paragraph, *p. 40.* he has these Words: *It is manifest that the Apostles, in their Epistles, taught Fundamentals; which is contrary to what this Gentleman says, that such a Thing could not be suppos'd.* And therefore the *Unmasker* has taken a great deal of Pains to shew that there are Fundamental Doctrines to be found in the Epistles; as if I had deny'd it. And to lead the Reader into an Opinion that I had said so, he sets down these Words, *Could not be suppos'd*; as if they were my Words. And so they are; but not to that Purpose. And therefore he did well not to quote the Page, lest the Reader, by barely turning to the Place, should have a clear Sight of Falshood,

hood, instead of that *Sincerity* which he would make the Reader believe is wanting in me. My Words, *p. 251. of the Reasonableness of Christianity*, are, "NOR CAN
 "IT BE SUPPOS'D, that the sending
 "of such Fundamentals was the Reason
 "of the Apostles writing to any of them." And a little lower: "The Epistles there-
 "fore being all written to those who were
 "already Believers and Christians, the
 "Occasion and End of writing them could
 "not be to instruct them in that which
 "was necessary to make them Christians." The Thing then that I deny'd, was not that there were any Fundamentals in the Epistles: For, *p. 252.* I have these express Words; "I do not deny but the great
 "Doctrines of the Christian Faith are
 "dropt here and there, and scattered up
 "and down in most of them." And therefore he might have spared his Endeavours, in the next Paragraph, to prove that there may be Fundamentals found in the Epistles, till he finds some-body that denies it. And here again I must repeat my usual Question, that with this sincere Writer is so often necessary, *viz.*

XVII. Where it is that I say, *that it cannot be suppos'd that there are Fundamental Articles in the Epistles?*

If

If he hopes to shift it off by the Word *taught*, which seems fallaciously put in; as if he meant, that there were some Fundamental Articles *taught*, necessary to be believ'd to make them Christians, in the Epistles, which those whom they were writ to, knew not before: In this Sense I do deny it; and then this will be the

XVIIth Proposition remaining upon him to prove, *viz.*

That there are Fundamental Articles, necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, taught in the Epistles, which those, whom they were writ to, knew not before.

The former Part of his next Paragraph, p. 40. runs thus: *Hear another feigned Ground of his omitting the Epistles, viz. Because the Fundamental Articles are here promiscuously, and without distinction, mix'd with other Truths. P. 41. But who sees not that this is a mere Elusion? For, on the same Account, he might have forborn to search for Fundamental Articles in the Gospels; for they do not lie there together, but are dispers'd up and down. The Doctrinal and Historical Parts are mix'd with one another, but he pretends to sever them. Why then did he not make a Separation be-*

114 *A Second Vindication of the
tween the Doctrines in the Epistles, and
those other Matters that are treated of there?
He has nothing to reply to this; and there-
fore we must again look upon what he has
suggested, as a Cast of his shuffling Faculty.*

The Argument contain'd in these Words, is this. A Man cannot well distinguish Fundamental from Non-fundamental Doctrines in the Epistles, where they are promiscuously mix'd with Non-fundamental Doctrines: Therefore he cannot well distinguish Fundamental Doctrines from others in the *Gospels*, and the *Acts*, where they are mix'd with Matters of Fact. As if he should say, one cannot well distinguish a Batchelor of Divinity from other Divines, where several of them stand together promiscuously in the same Habit; therefore one cannot distinguish a Batchelor of Divinity from a *Billingsgate* Orator, where they stand together in their distinct Habits: Or, that it is as easy to distinguish fine Gold from that of a little lower Allay, where several Pieces of each are mix'd together, as it is to distinguish Pieces of fine Gold from Pieces of Silver which they are mix'd among.

But it seems the *Unmasker* thinks it is as easy to distinguish between Fundamental and not Fundamental Doctrines, in a Writing of the same Author, where they are promiscuously mix'd together, as it is to distin-

distinguish between a Fundamental Doctrine of Faith, and a Relation of Matter of Fact, where they are intermixedly reported in the same History. When he has proved this, the *Unmasker* will have more reason to tax me with *Elusion*, *Shuffling* and *Feigning*, in the Reason I gave for not collecting Fundamentals out of the Epistles. Till then, all that Noise must stand amongst those ridiculous Airs of Triumph and Victory, which he so often gives himself, without the least Advantage to his Cause, or Edification of his Reader; though he should a thousand Times say, *That I have nothing to reply.*

In the latter Part of this Paragraph he says, *That necessary Truths, Fundamental Principles, may be distinguished from those that are not such, in the Epistolary Writings, by the Nature and Importance of them, by their immediate Respect to the Author and Means of our Salvation.*

Answ. If this be so, I desire him to give me a definitive Collection of Fundamentals out of the Epistles, as I have given one out of the *Gospels*, and the *Acts*. If he cannot do that, 'tis plain he hath here given a distinguishing Mark of Fundamentals, by which he himself cannot distinguish them. But yet I am the Shuffler.

The Argument in the next Paragraph, p. 41. is this:

Necessary Doctrines of Faith, such as God absolutely demands to be believed for Justification, may be distinguished from Rules of holy Living, with which they are mix'd in the Epistles; therefore Doctrines of Faith necessary, and not necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, may be distinguished as they stand mix'd in the Epistles. Which is as good Sense as to say, Lambs and Kids may be easily distinguished in the same Penn, where they are together, by their different Natures: Therefore the Lambs I absolutely demand of you, as necessary to satisfy me, may be distinguished from others in the same Penn, where they are mix'd, without any Distinction. Doctrines of Faith, and Precepts of Practice, are as distinguishable as Doing and Believing; and those as easily discernable one from another, as Thinking and Walking: But Doctrinal Propositions, all of them of Divine Revelation, are of the same Authority, and of the same Species, in respect of the Necessity of believing them; and will be eternally undistinguishable into necessary and not necessary to be believed, till there be some other Way found to distinguish them, than that they are in a Book which is all of Divine Revelation. Though therefore Doctrines of Faith,

Faith, and Rules of Practice, are very distinguishable in the Epistles, yet it does not follow from thence, that Fundamental and not Fundamental Doctrines, Points necessary and not necessary to be believed to make Men Christians, are easily distinguishable in the Epistles. Which therefore remains to be proved: And it remains incumbent upon him,

XVIII. *To set down the Marks, whereby the Doctrines deliver'd in the Epistles may easily and exactly be distinguished into Fundamental, and not Fundamental Articles of Faith.*

All the rest of that Paragraph containing nothing against me, must be bound up with a great deal of the like Stuff, which the *Unmasker* has put into his Book, to shew the World he does not *imitate me in Impertinences, Incoherences, and trifling Excursions*, as he boasts in his first Paragraph. Only I shall desire the Reader to take the whole Passage concerning this Matter, as it stands in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 252. “ I do not deny,
“ but the great Doctrines of the Christian
“ Faith are dropp'd here and there, and
“ scatter'd up and down in most of them.
“ But 'tis not in the Epistles we are to
“ learn what are the Fundamental Ar-
I 3 ticles

“ ticles of Faith, where they are promif-
 “ cuously, and without diftinction, mix’d
 “ with other Truths and Difcourfes, which
 “ were (though for Edification indeed, yet)
 “ only Occafional. We fhall find and dif-
 “ cern thofe great and neceffary Points beft
 “ in the Preaching of our Saviour and his
 “ Apoftles, to thofe who were yet Stran-
 “ gers and ignorant of the Faith, to bring
 “ them in, and convert them to it.” And
 then let him read thefe Words, which the
Unmasker hath quoted out of them: *It is*
not in the Epiftles that we are to learn what
are Fundamental Articles of Faith; they
were written for the refolving of Doubts,
and reforming of Mistakes—with his Intro-
 duction of them in thefe Words: *He com-*
mands the Reader not to ftir a jot farther
than the Afts. If I fhould ask him where
 that Command appears, he muft have re-
 courfe to his old Shift, that he did not
 mean as he faid, or elfe ftand convicted
 of a malicious Untruth. An Orator is not
 bound to fpeak ftrict Truth, though a Dif-
 putant be. But this *Unmasker’s* writing
 againft me will excufe him from being of
 the latter: And then, why may not Falf-
 hoods pafs for Rhetorical *Flourifhes*, in one
 who hath been ufed to popular Haranguing;
 to which Men are not generally fo fevere
 as ftrictly to examine them, and expect
 that they fhould always be found to con-

tain nothing but precise Truth, and strict Reasoning? But yet I must not forget to put upon his Score this other Proposition of his, which he has, *p.* 42. and ask him to shew,

XIX. *Where it is that I command my Reader not to stir a jot farther than the Acts?*

In the next two Paragraphs, *p.* 42—46. the *Unmasker* is at his natural Play, of Declaiming without Proving. 'Tis pity the *Mishna*, out of which he takes his good *Breeding*, as it told him that *a well-bred and well-taught Man answers to the first in the first Place*, had not given him this Rule too about Order, *viz.* That Proving should go before Condemning; else all the fierce Exaggerations ill Language can heap up, are but empty Scurrility. But 'tis no wonder that the *Jewish* Doctors should not provide Rules for a Christian Divine, turn'd *Unmasker*. For where a Cause is to be maintained, and a Book to be writ, and Arguments are not at hand, yet something must be found to fill it: Railing, in such Cases, is much easier than Reasoning; especially where a Man's Parts lie that Way.

The first of these Paragraphs, *p.* 42. he begins thus: *But let us hear farther what*

this Vindicator saith to excuse his Rejection of the Doctrines contained in the Epistles, and his putting us off with one Article of Faith. And then he quotes these following Words of mine: "What if the Author
 " design'd his Treatise, as the Title shews,
 " chiefly for those who were not yet tho-
 " roughly and firmly Christians; purpo-
 " sing to work upon those, who either
 " wholly disbelieved, or doubted of the
 " Truth of the Christian Religion?"

Answ. This, as he has put it, is a downright Falshood: For the Words he quotes, were not used by me *to excuse my Rejection of the Doctrines contained in the Epistles, or to prove there was but one Article; but as a Reason why I omitted the mention of Satisfaction.*

To demonstrate this, I shall set down the whole Passage as it is, *p. 265.* of my *Vindication*; where it runs thus:

" But what will become of me, that I
 " have not mentioned *Satisfaction*!

" Possibly this Reverend Gentleman
 " would have had Charity enough for
 " a known Writer of the Brotherhood, to
 " have found it by an *Innuendo* in those
 " Words above quoted, of laying down
 " his Life for another. But every thing
 " is to be strained here the other Way.
 " For the Author of the *Reasonableness of*
 " *Christianity, &c.* is of necessity to be

“ represented as a *Socinian*; or else his
“ Book may be read, and the Truths in it,
“ which Mr. *Edwards* likes not, be re-
“ ceiv’d, and People put upon examining.
“ Thus one, as full of happy Conjectures
“ and Suspicions as this Gentleman, might
“ be apt to argue. But what if the Author
“ design’d his Treatise, as the Title shews,
“ chiefly for those who were not yet tho-
“ roughly or firmly Christians; proposing
“ to work on those, who either wholly
“ disbelieved, or doubted of the Truth of
“ the Christian Religion?”

To this he tells me, *p.* 43. that my *Title* says nothing for me, i. e. shews not that I design’d my Book for those that disbelieved or doubted of the Christian Religion.

Ans. I thought that a Title that professed the *Reasonableness* of any Doctrine, shew’d it was intended for those that were not fully satisfied of the *Reasonableness* of it; unless Books are to be writ to convince those of any thing, who are convinced already. But, possibly, this may be the *Unmasker’s* Way: And if you should judge by his Manner of treating this Subject, with Declamation instead of Argument, one would think that he meant it for no body but those who were of his Mind already. I thought therefore *The Reasonableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scripture*, a proper Title to signify whom it was chiefly

chiefly meant for: And, I thank God, I can with Satisfaction say it has not wanted its Effect upon some of them. But the *Unmasker* proves, for all that, that I could not design it chiefly for Disbelievers, or Doubters of the Christian Religion. *For*, says he, p. 43. *How those that wholly disregard and disbelieve the Scriptures of the New Testament, as Gentiles, Jews, Mahometans, and Atheists do* (I crave Leave to put in Theists instead of Atheists, for a Reason presently to be mention'd) *are like to attend to the Reasonableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scripture, is not to be conceived; and therefore we look upon this as all mere Sham and Sophistry.* *Answ.* Though the *Unmasker* teaches good Breeding out of the *Mishna*, yet I thought he had been a Minister of the Gospel, and had taught Christianity out of the Scripture. Why! good Sir, would you teach *Jews and Mahometans* Christianity out of the *Talmud* and *Alcoran*; because they are the Books, that at present they *attend to*, and believe? Or would you, laying by the Authority of all Books, preach Religion to Infidels in your own Name, and by your own Authority; laying aside the Scripture? *Is it not to be conceived*, no not by a Christian Divine, that the Way to make Unbelievers Christians, is to shew them the Reasonableness of the Religion
con-

contained in the Scriptures? But it seems the *Unmasker* has a peculiar Way of preaching and propagating Christianity without the Scripture, as some Men have a peculiar Way of disputing without Reason.

In the Beginning of this Paragraph, p. 43. the *Unmasker*, who is always a fair Interpreter of my Meaning, and never fails to know it better than I do, tells me, That by those that wholly disbelieve, *I must mean* Atheists, Turks, Jews, and Pagans; and by those that are not firmly Christians, *a few weak Christians*. But did our *Unmasker* never hear of Unbelievers, under a Denomination distinct from that of *Atheists, Turks, Jews, and Pagans*? Whilst the Pulpit and the Press have so often had up the Name of *Theists* or *Deists*, has that Name wholly scap'd him? 'Twas these I chiefly design'd; and I believe no body of all that read my Vindication, but the *Unmasker*, mistook me, if he did. But there at least, p. 268. he might have found the Name, as of a Sort of Unbelievers not unknown amongst us. But whatever he thought, it was convenient, and a Sort of *Prudence* in him (when he would persuade others that I had not a Design, which I say I had) to lessen as much as he could, and cover the Need of any such Design; and so make it, that I could not intend my Book to work upon those that
dis-

disbelieved, or did not firmly believe, by insinuating there were *few* or none such amongst us. Hence he says, that by those that are not thoroughly and firmly Christians, *I mean a FEW weak Christians*; as well as under those, who wholly disbelieve, he left the *Theists* out of my Meaning. I am very glad to hear from the *Unmasker* that there are but *few weak Christians*, few that have Doubts about the Truth of Christianity, amongst us. But if there be not a great Number of *Deists*, and that the preventing their Increase be not worth every true Christian's Care and Endeavours, those who have been so loud against them have been much to blame; and I wish to God there were no Reason for their Complaints. For these therefore I take the Liberty to say, as I did before, that I chiefly design'd my Book; and shall not be ashamed of this *Sophistry*, as you call it (if it can be *Sophistry* to alledge a Matter of Fact that I know) till you have Arguments to convince me, that you know my Intention in publishing it, better than I do my self. And I shall think it still no blameable *Prudence*, however you exclaim against *Prudence* (as perhaps you have some Reason) that " I mention'd only
 " those Advantages, that all Christians are
 " agreed in; and that I observed that
 " Command of the Apostle, *Rom. xiv. 1.*
 " *Him*

“ *Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye,*
“ *but not to doubtful Disputations ; with-*
“ *out being a Socinian.* I think I did not
“ amiss, that I offer’d to the Belief of
“ those that stood off, that, and only that,
“ which our Saviour and his Apostles
“ preach’d for the reducing the uncon-
“ verted World. And would any one
“ think him in earnest, when about to
“ persuade Men to be Christians, who
“ should use that as an Argument to re-
“ commend the Gospel, which he has ob-
“ served Men to lay hold on as an Objection
“ against it? To urge such Points of Con-
“ troversy as necessary Articles of Faith,
“ when we see our Saviour and the Apo-
“ stles urged them not as necessary to be
“ believed to make Men Christians, is (by
“ our own Authority) to add Prejudices
“ to Prejudices ; and to block up our own
“ Way to those Men, whom we would
“ have Access to, and prevail upon.”

I have repeated this again out of the 266th Page of my *Vindication*, where there is more to the same Purpose ; that the Reader may see how fully the *Unmasker* has answer’d it.

Because I said, “ Would any one blame
“ my Prudence, if I mention’d only those
“ Advantages which all Christians are
“ agreed in ;” the *Unmasker* adds, *p.* 44.
Socinian Christians ; And then, as if the
naming

naming of that had gained him his Point, he goes on victoriously, thus: *He has be-thought himself better, since he first publish'd his Notions; and (as the Result of that) he now begins to resolve, what he writ, into Prudence. I know whence he had this Method (and 'tis likely he has taken more than this from the same Hand) viz. from the Missionary Jesuits, that went to preach the Gospel to the People of China. We are told, that they instructed them in some Matters relating to our Saviour; they let them know that Jesus was the Messias, the Person promised to be sent into the World: But they conceal'd his Sufferings and Death, and they would not let them know any thing of his Passion and Crucifixion. So our Author (their humble Imitator) undertakes to instruct the World in Christianity, with an Omission of its principal Articles; and more especially that of the Advantage we have by Christ's Death, which was the prime Thing design'd in his coming into the World. This he calls Prudence. So that to hide from the People the main Articles of the Christian Religion, to disguise the Faith of the Gospel, to betray Christianity it self, is, according to this excellent Writer, the Cardinal Virtue of Prudence. May we be delivered then, say I, from a Prudential Racovian! And there ends the Rattling for this Time; not to be out-done by any Piece of Clock-work*
in

in the Town. When he is once set a-going, he runs on like an Alarum, always in the same Strain of noisy, empty Declamation (wherein every thing is suppos'd, and nothing prov'd) till his own Weight has brought him to the Ground: And then, being wound up with some new Topick, takes another Run; whether it makes for or against him, it matters not: He has laid about him with ill Language, let it light where it will, and the *Vindicator* is paid off.

That I may keep the due Distance in our different Ways of Writing, I shall shew the Reader that I say not this at random, but that the Place affords me occasion to say so. He begins this Paragraph with these Words, *p. 42. Let us hear farther what this Vindicator says, to excuse his Rejection of the Doctrines contained in the Epistles.* This *Rejection of the Doctrines contained in the Epistles*, was the not mentioning the *Satisfaction* of Christ amongst those Advantages I shew'd that the World received by his Coming. This appears by the Words he here quotes, as my Excuse for that Omission. In which Place I also produced some Passages in my Book which *sounded like it*, some Words of Scripture that are used to prove it: But this will not content him; I am, for all that, a *Betrayer of Christianity, and Con-*
temner

temner of the Epistles. Why? Because I did not, out of them, name *Satisfaction*. If you will have the Truth of it, Sir, there is not any such Word in any one of the Epistles, or other Books of the *New Testament*, in my Bible, as *Satisfying* or *Satisfaction* made by our Saviour; and so I could not put it into my *Christianity as deliver'd in the Scripture*. If mine be not a true Bible, I desire you to furnish me with one that is more Orthodox; or if the Translators have *hid that main Article of the Christian Religion*, they are the *Betrayers of Christianity, and Contemners of the Epistles*, who did not put it there; and not I, who did not take a Word from thence, which they did not put there. For truly, I am not a Maker of Creeds; nor dare add either to the Scripture, or to the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion.

But you will say, *Satisfaction*, though not named in the Epistles, yet may plainly be collected out of them. *Ans.* And so it may out of several Places in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*; some whereof, which I took out of the Gospels, I mentioned in my *Vindication*, p. 264. and others of them, which I took out of the Epistles, I shall point out to you now: As, p. 67. I say the Design of our Saviour's Coming was to be *OFFERED* up;
and

and p. 138. I speak of the Work of our *REDEMPTION*; Words, which in the Epistles are taken to imply *Satisfaction*. And therefore if that be enough, I see not but I may be free from *betraying Christianity*; but if it be necessary to name the Word *Satisfaction*, and he that does not so is a *Betrayer of Christianity*, you will do well to consider how you will acquit the Holy Apostles from that bold Imputation; which, if it be extended as far as it will go, will scarce come short of Blasphemy: For I do not remember that our Saviour has any where named *Satisfaction*, or implied it plainer in any Words than those I have quoted from him; and he, I hope, will escape the Intemperance of your Tongue.

You tell me, I had my *Prudence* from the *Missionary Jesuits in China*, who concealed our Saviour's *Sufferings and Death*, because I undertake to instruct the World in *Christianity*, with an Omission of its *Principal Articles*. And I pray, Sir, from whom did you learn your *Prudence*, when taking upon you to teach the *Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity*, in your *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, you left out several, that you have been pleased since to add in your *Socinianism Unmask'd*? Or if I, as you say here, *betray Christianity* by this Omission of this *Principal Article*;

130 *A Second Vindication of the*
ticle; what do you, who are a professed
Teacher of it, if you omit any principal
Article, which your *Prudence* is so wary
in, that you will not say you have given
us all that are necessary to Salvation, in
that List you have last published? I pray,
who acts best the *Jesuit* (whose *bumble*
Imitator you say I am) you or I; when
pretending to give a Catalogue of Funda-
mentals, you have not reduced them to
direct Propositions; but have left some of
them indefinite, to be collected as every
one pleases: and, instead of telling us it
is a perfect Catalogue of Fundamentals,
plainly shuffle it off, and tell me, *p. 22.*
If that will not content me, you are sure
you can do nothing that will: If I require
more, it is Folly in you to comply with me?
One Part of what you here say, I own to
you, favours not much of the Skill of a
Jesuit. You confess your Inability; and
I believe it to be perfectly true: That if
what you have done already (which is no-
thing at all) *will not content me, you are*
sure you can do nothing that will content me,
or any reasonable Man, that shall demand
of you a compleat Catalogue of Funda-
mentals. But you make it up pretty well,
with a Confidence becoming one of that
Order. For he must have rubb'd his Fore-
head hard, who in the same Treatise, where
he so severely condemns the Imperfection
of
of

of my List of Fundamentals, confesses that he cannot give a compleat Catalogue of his own.

You publish to the World, in this 44th, and the next Page, that *I hide from the People the main Articles of the Christian Religion; I disguise the Faith of the Gospel, betray Christianity it self, and imitate the Jesuits that went to preach the Gospel to the People of China, by my Omission of its principal or main Articles.*

Ans. I know not how I *disguise* the Faith of the Gospel, &c. in Imitation of the *Jesuits in China*; unless taking Men off from the Inventions of Men, and recommending to them the Reading and Study of the Holy Scripture; to find what the Gospel is, and requires, be a *disguising the Faith of the Gospel, a betraying of Christianity, and an imitating the Jesuits.* Besides, Sir (if one may ask you) in what School did you learn that prudent Wariness and Reserve, which so eminently appears, *p. 24. of your Socinianism Unmask'd*, in these Words: *These Articles* (meaning those which you had before enumerated as Fundamental) *of Faith, are such as must IN SOME MEASURE be known and assented to by a Christian; such as must GENERALLY be received, and embraced by him?* You will do well, the next Time, to set down how far your Fun-

132 *A Second Vindication of the*
damentals must *be known, assented to, and received*; to avoid the Suspicion, that there is a little more of *Jesuitism* in these Expressions, *in some Measure known and assented to, and generally received and embraced*, than what becomes a sincere Protestant-Preacher of the Gospel. For your speaking so doubtfully of knowing and assenting to those, which you give us for Fundamental Doctrines, which belong (as you say) to the very *Essence of Christianity*, will hardly escape being imputed to your want of Knowledge, or want of Sincerity. And indeed the Word *General* is in familiar Use with you, and stands you in good stead, when you would say something, you know not what; as I shall have occasion to remark to you, when I come to your 91st Page.

Farther, I do not remember where it was that I mentioned, or undertook to set down all the *principal, or main Articles of Christianity*. To change the Terms of the Question, from Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, into *principal or main Articles*, looks a little Jesuitical. But to pass by that: The Apostles, when they *went to preach the Gospel to People* as much Strangers to it, as the *Chineses* were when the *Europeans* came first amongst them, *Did they hide from the People the main Articles of the Christian*

Christian Religion; disguise the Faith of the Gospel, and betray Christianity it self? If they did not, I am sure I have not: For I have not omitted any of the *main Articles*, which they preached to the unbelieving World. Those I have set down, with so much Care not to omit any of them, that you blame me for it more than once, and call it *tedious*. However you are pleased to acquit or condemn the Apostles, in the Case of your supreme Determination, I am very indifferent. If you think fit to condemn them for *disguising* or *betraying the Christian Religion*, because they said no more of *Satisfaction* than I have done, in their Preaching at first to their unbelieving Auditors, *Jews* or *Heathens*, to make them as I think Christians (for that I am now speaking of) I shall not be sorry to be found in their Company, under what Censure soever. If you are pleased graciously to take off this your Censure from them, for this *Omission*, I shall claim a Share in the same Indulgence.

But to come to what perhaps you will think your self a little more concerned not to censure, than what the *Apostles* did so long since; for you have given Instances of being very apt to make bold with the Dead: Pray tell me, does the Church of *England* admit People into the Church of

Christ at hap-hazard? or without proposing, and requiring a Profession of all that is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian? If she does not, I desire you to turn to the Baptism of those of riper Years, in our Liturgy: Where the Priest asking the Convert particularly, whether he believes the Apostles Creed, which he repeats to him; upon his Profession that he does, and that he desires to be baptized into that Faith, without one Word of any other Articles, baptizes him; and then declares him a Christian, in these Words: *We receive this Person into the Congregation of Christ's Flock, and sign him with the Sign of the Cross, in token that he shall not be ashamed—to CONTINUE Christ's faithful Soldier and Servant.* In all this there is not one Word of *Satisfaction*, no more than in my Book; nor so much neither. And here I ask you, Whether, for this *Omission*, you will pronounce that the Church of *England disguises the Faith of the Gospel*? However you think fit to treat me, yet methinks you should not let your self loose so freely against our first Reformers, and the Fathers of our Church ever since, as to call them *Betrayers of Christianity it self*; because they think not so much necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, as
you

you are pleased to put down in your Articles; but omit, as well as I, your *main Article of Satisfaction*.

Having thus notably harangu'd upon the Occasion of my saying, "Would any one blame my Prudence?" and thereby made me a *Socinian*, a *Jesuit*, and a *Betrayer of Christianity it self*, he has in that answered all that such a Miscreant as I do or can say; and so passes by all the Reasons I gave, for what I did, without any other Notice or Answer, but only denying a Matter of Fact, which I only can know, and he cannot; viz. my Design in Printing my *Reasonableness of Christianity*.

In the next Paragraph, p. 45. in answer to these Words of St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 1. *Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not to doubtful Disputations*; which I brought as a Reason why I mentioned not *Satisfaction* amongst the Benefits received by the Coming of our Saviour; because, as I tell him in my *Vindication*, p. 266. my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, as the Title shews, was "design'd chiefly for those who were not yet thoroughly or firmly Christians;" he replies, and I desire him to prove it,

XX. *That I pretend a Design of my Book, which was never so much as thought of,*

136 *A Second Vindication of the*
till I was sollicitated by my Brethren to
vindicate it.

All the rest in this Paragraph being either nothing to this Place of the *Romans*, or what I have answer'd elsewhere, needs no farther Answer.

The next two Paragraphs, p. 46—49. are meant for an Answer to something I had said concerning the Apostles Creed, upon the Occasion of his charging my Book with *Socinianism*. They begin thus:

This *Author of the New Christianity* [*Answ.* This New Christianity is as old as the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, and a little older than the *Unmasker's* System] *wisely objects that the Apostles Creed bath none of those Articles which I mention, p. 271. Answ.* If that Author *wisely objects*, the *Unmasker* would have done well to have replied *wisely*. But for a Man *wisely* to reply, it is in the first Place requisite that the Objection be truly and fairly set down in its full Force, and not represented short, and as will best serve the Answerer's Turn to reply to. This is neither wise, nor honest: And this first Part of a *wise* Reply the *Unmasker* has failed in. This will appear from my Words, and the Occasion of them. The *Unmasker* had accused my Book of *Socinianism*, for omit-

omitting some Points, which he urg'd as necessary Articles of Faith. To which I answered, That he had done so only "to give it an ill Name; not because it was Socinian, for he had no more reason to charge it with *Socinianism* for the Omissions he mentions, than the Apostles Creed." These are my Words; which he should have either set down out of p. 271. which he quotes, or at least given the Objection as I put it, if he had meant to have clear'd it by a fair Answer. But he, instead thereof, contents himself that *I object, That the Apostles Creed hath none of those Articles and Doctrines, which the Unmasker mentioned.* *Answ.* This, at best, is but a Part of my Objection, and not to the Purpose which I there meant, without the rest join'd to it; which it hath pleased the *Unmasker*, according to his laudable Way, to conceal. My Objection therefore stands thus:

That the same Articles, for the Omission whereof the *Unmasker* charges my Book with *Socianism*, being also omitted in the Apostles Creed, he has no more reason to charge my Book with *Socinianism*, for the Omissions mentioned, than he hath to charge the Apostles Creed with *Socinianism*.

To this Objection of mine let us now see how he answers, p. 47.

Nor does any considerate Man wonder at it [i. e. That the Apostles Creed hath none of those Articles and Doctrines which he had mentioned]. For the Creed is a Form of outward Profession, which is chiefly to be made in the publick Assemblies, when Prayers are put up in the Church, and the Holy Scriptures are read. Then this Abridgement of Faith is properly used, or when there is not Time or Opportunity to make any Enlargement. But we are not to think it expressly contains in it all the necessary and weighty Points, all the important Doctrines of Belief; it being only designed to be an Abstract.

Answ. Another indispensable Requisite, in a wise Reply, is, that it should be pertinent. Now what can there be more impertinent, than to confess the Matter of Fact upon which the Objection is grounded; but instead of destroying the Inference drawn from that Matter of Fact, only amuse the Reader with wrong Reasons, why that Matter of Fact was so?

No considerate Man, he says, doth wonder that the Articles and Doctrines he mentioned, are omitted in the Apostles Creed: Because that Creed is a Form of outward Profession. *Answ.* A Profession!
Of

Of what I beseech you ? Is it a *Form* to be used for *Form's* sake ? I thought it had been a *Profession* of something, even of the Christian Faith : And if it be so, any *considerate Man may wonder* necessary Articles of the Christian Faith should be left out of it. For how it can be an *outward Profession* of the Christian Faith, without containing the Christian Faith, I do not see ; unless a Man can *outwardly profess* the Christian Faith in Words, that do not contain or express it, *i. e.* profess the Christian Faith, when he does not profess it. But he says, 'Tis a *Profession chiefly to be made use of in Assemblies.* *Answ.* Do those solemn *Assemblies* privilege it from containing the necessary Articles of the Christian Religion ? This proves not that it does not, or was not *designed* to contain all Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian ; unless the *Unmasker* can prove that a *Form of outward Profession* of the Christian Faith, that contains all such necessary Articles, cannot be made use of in the Publick Assemblies. *In the Publick Assemblies,* says he, *when Prayers are put up by the Church, and the Holy Scriptures are read, then this Abridgment of Faith is properly used ; or when there is not generally Time or Opportunity to make an Enlargement.* *Answ.* But that which contains not what is absolutely necessary to
be

be believed to make a Man a Christian, can no where be *properly* used as a *Form of outward Profession* of the Christian Faith, and least of all in the solemn *Publick Assemblies*. All the Sense I can make of this is, That *this Abridgment* of the Christian Faith, *i. e.* imperfect Collection (as the *Unmasker* will have it) of some of the Fundamental Articles of Christianity in the Apostles Creed, which omits the greatest Part of them, is made use of as a *Form of outward Profession* of but part of the Christian Faith in the *Publick Assemblies*; when by Reason of reading of the *Scripture* and *Prayers*, there is not *Time* or *Opportunity* for a full and perfect Profession of it.

'Tis strange the Christian Church should not find *Time* nor *Opportunity* in sixteen hundred Years to make, in any of her Publick Assemblies, a Profession of so much of her Faith as is necessary to make a Man a Christian. But pray tell me, has the Church any such full and compleat Form of Faith, that hath in it all those Propositions, you have given us for necessary Articles (not to say any thing of those which you have reserved to your self in your own Breast, and will not communicate) of which the Apostles Creed is only a scanty *Form*, a brief imperfect *Abstract*, us'd only to save Time in the Croud
of

of other pressing Occasions, that are always in haste to be dispatch'd? If she has, the *Unmasker* will do well to produce it. If the Church has no such compleat Form, besides the Apostles Creed, any where, of Fundamental Articles; he will do well to leave talking idly of this *Abstract*, as he goes on to do in the following Words:

But, says he, we are not to think that it expressly contains in it all the necessary and weighty Points, all the important Doctrines of our Belief; it being only designed to be an Abstract. Answ. Of what, I beseech you, is it an *Abstract*? For here the *Unmasker* stops short, and as one that knows not well what to say, speaks not out what it is an *Abstract* of; but provides himself a Subterfuge in the generality of the preceding Terms, of *necessary and weighty Points, and important Doctrines* jumbled together; which can be there of no other Use but to cover his Ignorance or Sophistry. But the Question being only about *necessary* Points, to what purpose are *weighty and important Doctrines* joined to them; unless he will say, that there is no difference between *necessary* and *weighty Points, Fundamental and Important Doctrines*? And if so, then the Distinction of Points into *necessary* and not *necessary*, will be foolish and impertinent; and all the Doctrines contained in the Bible will
be

be absolutely necessary to be explicitly believed by every Man to make him a Christian. But taking it for granted, that the Distinction of Truths contained in the Gospel into Points absolutely necessary, and not absolutely necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, is good; I desire the *Unmasker* to tell us, what the Apostles Creed is an Abstract of. He will perhaps answer, that he has told us already in this very Page, where he says it is an *Abridgment of Faith*; and he has said true in words, but saying those Words by rote after others, without understanding them, he has said so in a Sense that is not true. For he supposes it an *Abridgment of Faith*, by containing only a few of the necessary Articles of Faith, and leaving out the far greater Part of them; and so takes a part of a thing for an *Abridgment* of it; whereas an *Abridgment* or *Abstract* of any Thing, is the whole in little; and if it be of a Science or Doctrine, the *Abridgment* consists in the essential or necessary Parts of it, contracted into a narrower Compass than where it lies diffus'd in the ordinary Way of Delivery, amongst a great Number of Transitions, Explanations, Illustrations, Proofs, Reasonings, Corollaries, &c. All which, though they make a Part of the Discourse wherein that Doctrine is deliver'd, are left out in the *Abridgment* of it,

it, wherein all the necessary Parts of it are drawn together into a less Room. But though an *Abridgment* need to contain none but the essential and necessary Parts, yet all those it ought to contain; or else it will not be an *Abridgment* or *Abstract* of that Thing, but an *Abridgment* only of a Part of it. I think it could not be said to be an *Abridgment* of the Law contained in an Act of Parliament, wherein any of the Things required by that Act were omitted; which yet commonly may be reduc'd into a very narrow Compass, when stripp'd of all the Motives, Ends, Enacting Forms; &c. express'd in the Act it self. If this does not satisfy the *Unmasker* what is properly an *Abridgment*, I shall refer him to Mr. *Chillingworth*, who I think will be allowed to understand Sense, and to speak it properly, at least as well as the *Unmasker*. And what he says, happens to be in the very same Question between *Knot* the Jesuit, and him, that is here between the *Unmasker* and me: 'Tis but putting the *Unmasker* in the Jesuit's Place, and my self (if it may be allowed me without Vanity) in Mr. *Chillingworth*, the Protestant's; and Mr. *Chillingworth*'s very Words, *Chap. IV. § 65.* will exactly serve for my Answer. " You trifle affectedly, " confounding the Apostles Belief of the " whole Religion of Christ, as it com-

" pre-

“ prehends both what we are to do, and
 “ what we are to believe, with that Part
 “ of it which contains not Duties of Obe-
 “ dience, but only the necessary Articles
 “ of simple Faith. Now, though the
 “ Apostles Belief be, in the former Sense,
 “ a larger Thing than that which we call
 “ the Apostles Creed ; yet in the latter
 “ Sense of the Word, the Creed (I say)
 “ is a full Comprehension of their Belief,
 “ which you your self have formerly con-
 “ fessed, though somewhat fearful and
 “ inconstantly. And here again Unwil-
 “ lingsness to speak the Truth, makes you
 “ speak that which is hardly Sense, and
 “ call it an *Abridgment of some Articles*
 “ *of Faith*. For I demand those *some Ar-*
 “ *ticles* which you speak of, which are
 “ they? Those that are out of the Creed,
 “ or those that are in it? Those that are
 “ in it, it comprehends at large, and
 “ therefore it is not an *Abridgment* of
 “ them. Those that are out of it, it com-
 “ prehends not at all, and therefore it is
 “ not an *Abridgment* of them. If you
 “ would call it now an *Abridgment* of
 “ Faith, this would be Sense ; and signify
 “ thus much, That all the necessary Ar-
 “ ticles of the Christian Faith are com-
 “ prized in it. For this is the proper Du-
 “ ty of *Abridgments*, to leave out nothing
 “ necessary.” So that in Mr. Chilling-
 worth's

Body. How little different the Faith of the Antient Church was from the Faith I have mention'd, may be seen in these Words of *Tertullian*: *Regula fidei una omnino est, sola, immobilis, irreformabilis; Credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem Mundi conditorem, & Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia Die resuscitatum à Mortuis, receptum in Cælis, sedentem nunc ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos, per carnis etiam Resurrectionem. Hâc lege Fidei manente, cætera jam Disciplinæ & Conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis: Tert. de. Virg. Velan. in Principio.* This was the Faith that, in *Tertullian's* Time, suffic'd to make a Christian. And the Church of *England*, as I have remarked already, only proposes the Articles of the Apostles Creed to the Convert to be baptized; and upon his professing a Belief of them, asks whether he will be baptized in *THIS FAITH*, which (if we will believe the *Unmasker*) is *not the Faith of a Christian*. However the Church, without any more ado, upon the Profession of *THIS FAITH*, and no other, baptizes him into it. So that the Antient Church, if the *Unmasker* may be believed, baptized Converts into that Faith which is *not the Faith of a Christian*. And the Church of *Eng-*
land,

land, when she baptizes any one, makes him not a Christian. For that he is baptized only into a Faith that *is not the Faith of a Christian*, I would fain know how he can thereby be made a Christian? So that if the Omissions, which he so much blames in my Book, make me a *Socinian*, I see not how the Church of *England* will escape that Censure; since those Omissions are in that very Confession of Faith which she proposes, and upon a Profession whereof she baptizes those whom she designs to make Christians. But it seems that the *Unmasker* (who has made bold to unmask her too) reasons right, that the Church of *England* is mistaken, and makes none but *Socinian Christians*; or (as he is pleas'd now to declare) no Christians at all. Which, if true, the *Unmasker* had best look to it, whether he himself be a Christian, or no; for 'tis to be feared, he was baptized only into that Faith, which he himself confesses *is not the Faith of a Christian*.

But he brings himself off in these following Words: *All Matters of Faith, in some Manner, may be reduc'd to this brief Platform of Belief.* *Ans^w.* If that be enough to make him a True and an Orthodox Christian, he does not consider who in this Way he brings off with him: For I think he cannot deny, that all Mat-

ters of Faith, in some Manner, may be reduced to that *Abstract* of Faith which I have given, as well as to that brief *Platform* in the Apostles Creed. So that for ought I see, by this Rule, we are Christians or not Christians, Orthodox or not Orthodox, equally together.

But yet he says in the next Words: *When he calls it an Abstract or Abbreviature, it is imply'd, that there are more Truths to be known and assented to by a Christian in order to making him really so, than what we meet with here.* The quite contrary whereof (as has been shewn) is imply'd by its being call'd an *Abstract*. But what is that to the purpose? 'Tis not fit *Abstracts* and *Abbreviatures* should stand in an *Unmasker's* Way. They are Sounds Men have used for what they pleas'd; and why may not the *Unmasker* do so too, and use them in a Sense that may make the Apostles Creed be only a broken Scrap of the Christian Faith? However, in great Condescension, being willing to do the Apostles Creed what Honour he could, he says, *That all Matters of Faith, in some Manner, may be reduced to this brief Platform of Belief.* But yet, when it is set in Competition with the Creed, which he himself is making (for it is not yet finish'd) it is by no means to be allow'd as sufficient to make a Man a Christian.

There

There are more Truths to be known and assented to, in order to make a Man really a Christian. Which, what they are, the Church of *England* shall know, when this new Reformer thinks fit: And then she may be able to propose to those who are not yet so, a Collection of Articles of Belief, and baptize them anew into a Faith, which will really make them Christians: But hitherto, if the *Unmasker* may be credited, she has fail'd in it.

Yet he craves leave to tell me in the following Words, pag. 48. That the Apostles Creed hath more in it than I, or my Brethren, will subscribe to. Were it not the undoubted Privilege of the *Unmasker* to know me better than I do my self (for he is always telling me something of my self which I did not know) I would, in my Turn, crave leave to tell him, that this is the Faith I was baptized into, no one Tittle whereof I have renounced, that I know; and that I heretofore thought, that gave me Title to be a Christian. But the *Unmasker* hath otherwise determined: And I know not now where to find a Christian. For the Belief of the Apostles Creed will not, it seems, make a Man one: And what other Belief will, it does not yet please the *Unmasker* to tell us. But yet as to the *Subscribing* to the Apostles Creed, I must take leave to say, however

the *Unmasker* may be right in the Faith, he is out in the Morals of a Christian ; it being against the Charity of one, that is really so, to pronounce, as he does, peremptorily in a Thing that he cannot know ; and to affirm positively what I know to be a downright Falshood. But what others will do, it is not my Talent to determine ; that belongs to the *Unmasker*. Though as to all that are my *Brethren* in the Christian Faith, I may answer for them too, that they will also, with me, do that without which in that Sense they cannot be my Brethren.

Page 49. The *Unmasker* smartly convinces me of no small Blunder, in these Words: *But was it not judiciously said by this Writer, That " it is well for the " Compilers of the Creed, that they liv'd " not in my Days ? Pag. 271."* I tell you, Friend, it was impossible they should ; for the Learned Usher and Vossius, and others, have prov'd, that that Symbol was drawn up not at once, but that some Articles of it were adjoin'd many Years after, far beyond the Extent of any Man's Life ; and therefore the Compilers of the Creed could not live in my Days, nor could I live in theirs. *Ans^w.* But it seems that had they lived together, you could have lived in their Days. But, says he, I let this pass, as one of the Blunders of our thoughtful and
musing

musing Author. *Answ.* And I tell you, Friend, that unless it were to shew your Reading in *Usher* and *Vossius*, you had better have let this *Blunder* of mine alone. Does not the *Unmasker* give here a clear Proof, that he is no Changeling? Whatever Argument he takes in hand, weighty or trivial, material or not material to the Thing in Question, he brings it to the same Sort of Sense and Force. He would shew me guilty of an Absurdity, in saying, "It was well for the Compilers of the Creed, that they lived not in his Days." This he proves to be a *Blunder*, because they all lived not in one another's Days; therefore it was an Absurdity to suppose they might all live in his Days. As if there were any greater Absurdity to bring the Compilers, who lived possibly within a few Centuries of one another, by a Supposition, into one Time; than it is to bring the *Unmasker*, and any one of them who lived a thousand Years distant one from another, by a Supposition, to be Contemporaries: For 'tis by Reason of the Compilers living at a Distance one from another, that he proves it impossible for him to be their Contemporary. As if it were not as impossible in Fact, for him who was not born till above a thousand Years after, to live in any of their Days, as it is for any one of them to live in either

152 *A Second Vindication of the*
of those Compilers Days that died before
him. The Supposition of their living to-
gether is as easy of one as the other, at
what Distance soever they lived, and how
many soever there were of them. This
being so, I think it had been better for the
Unmasker to have let alone the *Blunder*,
and shew'd (which was his Business) that
he does not accuse the Compilers of the
Creed of being *all over Socinianiz'd*, as
well as he does me, since they were as guilt-
ty as I, of the Omission of those Articles
(viz. *That Christ is the Word of God. That*
God was God incarnate. The eternal and
ineffable Generation of the Son of God.
That the Son is in the Father, and Father
in the Son, which expresses their Unity) for
the Omission whereof, the *Unmasker* laid
Socinianism to my charge. So that it re-
mains still upon his Score to shew,

XXI. *Why these Omissions in the Apostles*
Creed, do not as well make the Ab-
stract, as my Abridgment of Faith, to
be Socinian?

Page 53. The *Unmasker* desires the Rea-
der to observe, *That this lank Faith of mine,*
is in a Manner no other than the Faith of a
Turk. And I desire the Reader to observe,
That this Faith of mine was all that our
Saviour and his Apostles preach'd to the

unbelieving World. And this our *Unmasker* cannot deny, as I think will appear to any one, who observes what he says, *p. 76, 77. of his Socinianism Unmasked.* And that they preached nothing but a *Faith, that was in a Manner no other than the Faith of a Turk*, I think none amongst Christians, but this bold *Unmasker*, will have the Irreverence profanely to say.

He tells us, *p. 54.* That the *Musselmen* (or, as he has for the Information of his Reader very pertinently prov'd, should be writ *Moslemim* ; without which, perhaps, we should not have known his Skill in *Arabick*) or, in plain *English*, the *Mahometans*, believe that *Christ is a good Man, and not above the Nature of a Man, and sent of God to give Instruction to the World : And my Faith*, he says, *is of the very same Scantling.* This I shall desire him to prove ; or, which in other Words he insinuates in this, and the neighbouring Pages, *viz.*

XXII. That that Faith, which I have affirm'd to be the Faith, which is requir'd to make a Man a Christian, is no other than what *Turks* believe, and is contain'd in the *Alcoran*.

Or,

Or, as he expresses it himself, *p. 55.*

That a Turk, according to me, is a Christian ; for I make the same Faith serve them both.

And particularly to shew where 'tis,
I say,

XXIII. *That Christ is not above the Nature of a Man, or have made that a necessary Article of the Christian Faith.*

And next where it is,

XXIV. *That I speak as meanly of Christ's Suffering on the Cross, and Death, as if there were no such Thing.*

For thus he says of me, *p. 54.* *I seem to have consulted the Mahometan Bible, which did say, Christ did not suffer on the Cross, did not die. For I, and my Allies, speak as meanly of these Articles, as if there were no such Thing.*

To shew our *Unmasker's* Veracity in this Case, I shall trouble my Reader with some Passages out of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*. P. 56. " When we consider that

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 155

“ he was to fill out the Time foretold of
“ his Ministry, and after a Life illustrious
“ in Miracles and good Works, attended
“ with Humility, Meekness, Patience and
“ *SUFFERINGS*, and every way con-
“ formable to the Prophecies of him, should
“ be led as a Sheep to the *Slaughter*; and
“ with all Quiet and Submission be brought
“ to the *CROSS*, though there were no
“ Guilt or Fault found in him.” And
p. 67. “ Contrary to the Design of his Co-
“ ming; which was to be *OFFER'D* up
“ a Lamb, blameless, and void of Offence.”
And p. 103. “ *Laying down his Life*, both
“ for *Jews* and *Gentiles*.” P. 155. “ Given
“ up to *Contempt*, *Torment* and *Death*.”
But say what I will, when the *Unmasker*
thinks fit to have it so, it is speaking out
of the Mahometan *Bible*, That *Christ* did
not suffer on the Cross, did not die; or, at
least, is speaking as meanly of these *Articles*,
as if no such Thing had been.

His next Slander is p. 55. in these Words:
*This Gentleman presents the World with a
very ill Notion of Faith; for the very Devils
are capable of all that Faith, which, he
says, makes a Christian.* It is not strange,
that the *Unmasker* should misrepresent the
Faith, which I say makes a Christian;
when it seems to be his whole Design to
misrepresent my Meaning every where.
The Frequency of his doing it I have shew'd
in

in abundance of Instances, to which I shall add an eminent one here; which shews what a fair Champion he is, for Truth and Religion.

Page 170. of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I give this Account of the Faith which makes a Christian; That it is
“ Mens entering themselves in the Kingdom
“ of God, owning and professing them-
“ selves the Subjects of Jesus, whom they
“ believe to be the *Messiah*, and receive
“ for their Lord and King: For that was
“ to be baptized in his Name.” This
Sense of believing Christ to be the *Messiah*,
that is, to take him for our King and Lord,
who is to be obeyed, I have expressed over
and over again: As, *p.* 180, 181. my
Words are, “ That as many of them as
“ would believe Jesus the Son of God
“ (whom he sent into the World) to be
“ the *Messiah*, the promised Deliverer,
“ and would receive him for their King
“ and Ruler, should have all their past
“ Sins, Disobedience and Rebellion, for-
“ given them. And if for the future they
“ lived in sincere Obedience to his Law,
“ to the utmost of their Power, the Sins
“ of human Frailty, for the Time to
“ come, as well as those of their past Lives,
“ should for his Son’s Sake, because they
“ gave themselves up to him to be his
“ Subjects, be forgiven them: And so their
Faith,

“ Faith, which made them to be baptized
“ into his Name (*i. e.* inroll themselves
“ into the Kingdom of *Jesus* the *Messiah*,
“ and profess themselves his Subjects; and
“ consequently live by the Laws of his
“ Kingdom) should be accounted to them
“ for Righteousness.” Which Account of
what is necessary, I close with these Words:
“ This is the *FAITH*, for which God
“ of his free Grace justifies sinful Man.”
And is this the *Faith* of Devils?

To the same Purpose, *p.* 185. are these
Words: “ The chief End of his Coming
“ was to be a King; and, as such, to be
“ received by those, who would be his
“ Subjects in the Kingdom which he came
“ to erect.” And again, *p.* 183. “ Only
“ those who have believed *Jesus* to be the
“ *Messiah*, and taken him for their King,
“ with a sincere Endeavour after Righte-
“ ousness in obeying his Law, shall have
“ their past Sins not imputed to them.”
And so again, *p.* 181, 182, 183, 196, 199.
and in several other Places; of which I
shall add but this one more, *p.* 196. “ ’Tis
“ not enough to believe him to be the
“ *Messiah*, unless we obey his Laws, and
“ take him to be our King to reign over
“ us.” Can the Devils thus believe him
to be the *Messiah*? Yet this is that which
by these, and abundance of other Places,
I

158 *A Second Vindication of the*

I have shewed to be the Meaning of believing him to be the *Messiah*.

Besides, I have expressly distinguished the Faith which makes a Christian, from that which the Devils have; by proving, that, to the believing Jesus to be the *Messiah*, must be join'd Repentance, or else it will not make them true Christians: And what this Repentance is, may be seen at large, in *p. 171, &c.* Some Expressions whereof I shall here set down: As *p. 172.*

“ Repentance does not consist in one single
 “ Act of Sorrow (though that being first,
 “ and leading, gives Denomination to the
 “ whole) but in doing Works meet for
 “ Repentance, in a sincere Obedience to
 “ the Law of *Christ* the Remainder of our
 “ Lives.” Again: To distinguish the
 Faith of a *Christian* from that of Devils,
 I say expressly, out of *St. Paul's* Epistle to
 the *Galatians*, “ That which availeth is
 “ *Faith*, but *Faith* working by *Love*; and
 “ that *Faith* without Works, *i. e.* the
 “ Works of sincere Obedience to the Law
 “ and Will of *Christ*, is not sufficient for
 “ our Justification.” And *p. 192.* “ That
 “ to inherit eternal Life, we must love the
 “ Lord our God with all our Heart, with
 “ all our Soul, with all our Strength, and
 “ with all our Mind.” And, *p. 193.* “ Love
 “ *Christ*, in keeping his Commandments.”

This,

This, and a great deal more to this Purpose, may be seen in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*; particularly where I answer that Objection about the Faith of Devils, which I handle in *p. 167, &c.* and therein at large shew wherein the Faith of Devils comes short of the Justifying Faith which makes a Christian. And yet the good, the sincere, the candid *Unmasker*, with his becoming Confidence, tells his Readers here, *p. 55. That I present the World with a very ill Notion of Faith: For the very Devils are capable of all that Faith, which I say makes a Christian Man.*

To prevent this Calumny, I, in more Places than one, distinguished between Faith in a strict Sense, as it is a bare Assent to any Proposition, and that which is called Evangelical Faith, in a larger Sense of the Word; which comprehends under it something more than a bare, simple Assent: As, *p. 41. "I mean, this is all that is required to be believed by those who acknowledge but one Eternal, Invisible God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth: For that there is something more required to Salvation, besides Believing, we shall see hereafter." P. 44. "All, I say, that was to be believed for Justification. For that this was not all that was required to be done for Justification, we shall see hereafter." P. 82.*

"Obey-

“ Obeying the Law of the *Messiah* their
 “ King, being no less required than their
 “ *believing* that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*,
 “ the King and Deliverer, that was pro-
 “ mised them.” P. 167. “ As far as *mere*
 “ *Believing* could make them Members of
 “ *Christ’s Body*.” By these, and more the
 like Passages in my Book, my Meaning is
 so evident, that no body but an *Unmasker*
 would have said, that when I spoke of *Be-
 lieving* as a bare speculative Assent to any
 Proposition as true, I affirmed that was
 all that was required of a Christian for Ju-
 stification: Though that, in the strict
 Sense of the Word, is all that is done in
Believing. And therefore, I say, as far
 as *mere Believing* could make them Mem-
 bers of *Christ’s Body*, plainly signifying,
 as much as Words can, that the *Faith*,
 for which they were justified, included
 something more than a bare Assent; this
 appears not only from these Words of
 mine, p. 170. *St. Paul often, in his Epistles,*
puts Faith for the whole Duty of a Christian;
 but from my so often, and almost every
 where interpreting *believing him to be the*
Messiah, by *taking him to be our King*:
 Whereby is meant not a bare, idle Specu-
 lation, a bare notional Persuasion of any
 Truth whatsoever floating in our Brains;
 but an active Principle of Life, a *Faith*
 working by Love and Obedience. *To take*
him

him to be our King, carries with it a right Disposition of the Will to honour and obey him, join'd to that Assent wherewith Believers embrace this Fundamental Truth, that Jesus was the Person who was, by God, sent to be their King; he that was promised to be their Prince and Saviour.

But for all this, the *Unmasker*, p. 56. confidently tells his Reader that I say no such Thing. His Words are: *But besides this Historical Faith (as it is generally call'd by Divines) which is giving Credit to Evangelical Truths, as barely revealed, there must be something else added to make up the true substantial Faith of a Christian. With the Assent of the Understanding, must be join'd the Consent or Approbation of the Will. All those divine Truths which the Intellect assents to, must be allow'd of, by this elective Power of the Soul. True Evangelical Faith is a hearty Acceptation of the Messias, as he is offer'd in the Gospel. It is a sincere and impartial Submission to all Things required by the Evangelical Law, which is contained in the Epistles, as well as the other Writings. And to this Practical Assent and Choice, there must be added likewise a firm Trust and Reliance in the blessed Author of our Salvation. But this late Undertaker, who attempted to give us a more perfect Account than ever was before of Christianity, as it is delivered in the Scrip-*

M

tures,

tures, brings us no Tidings of any such Faith belonging to Christianity, or discovered to us in the Scriptures. Which gives us to understand, that he verily believes there is no such Christian Faith: For in some of his numerous Pages (especially p. 128, &c.) where he speaks so much of Belief and Faith, he might have taken occasion to insert one Word about this compleat Faith of the Gospel.

Though the Places above quoted, out of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, and the whole Tenor of the latter Part of it, shew the Falshood of what the *Unmasker* here says; yet I will set down one Passage more out of it, and then ask our *Unmasker*, when he hath read them, whether he hath the Brow to say again, that *I bring no Tidings of any such Faith?* My Words are, *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 210, 211. “Faith in the Promises of God, relying and acquiescing in his Word” and Faithfulness, the Almighty takes “well at our Hands, as a great Mark of” “Homage paid by us poor frail Creatures” “to his Goodness and Truth, as well as to” “his Power and Wisdom; and accepts it” “as an Acknowledgment of his peculiar” “Providence and Benignity to us. And” “therefore our Saviour tells us, *John xii. 44.*” “*He that believes on me, believes not on me,*” “*but on him that sent me.* The Works of
“ Nature

“ Nature shew his Wisdom and Power :
“ But 'tis his peculiar Care of Mankind,
“ most eminently discovered in his Pro-
“ mises to them, that shews his Bounty and
“ Goodness; and, consequently, engages
“ their Hearts in Love and Affection to
“ him. This Oblation of an Heart fix'd
“ with Dependance and Affection on him,
“ is the most acceptable Tribute we can
“ pay him; the Foundation of true Devo-
“ tion, and Life of all Religion. What a
“ Value he puts on this depending on his
“ Word, and resting satisfied on his Pro-
“ mises, we have an Example in *Abraham*,
“ whose Faith was counted to him for
“ Righteousness; as we have before re-
“ marked, out of *Rom. iv.* And his rely-
“ ing firmly on the Promise of God, with-
“ out any doubt of its Performance, gave
“ him the Name of the Father of the
“ Faithful; and gain'd him so much Fa-
“ vour with the Almighty, that he was
“ called the Friend of God: The highest
“ and most glorious Title that can be be-
“ stow'd on a Creature.”

The great Outcry he makes against me
in his two next Sections, *p.* 57—60. as
if I intended to introduce Ignorance and
Popery, is to be entertain'd rather as the
Noise of a petulant Scold, saying the worst
Things she could think of, than as the ar-
guing of a Man of Sense and Sincerity.

All this mighty Accusation is grounded upon these Falshoods: That *I make it my great Business to beat Men off from divine Truths*: That *I cry down all Articles of the Christian Faith but one*: That *I will not suffer Men to look into Christianity*: That *I blast the Epistolary Writings*. I shall add

no more to what I have already said about the Epistles, but those few Words out of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 252.

“ The Epistles resolving Doubts, and reforming Mistakes, are of great Advantage to our Knowledge and Practice.”

And, p. 255. “ An explicit Belief of what

“ God requires of those, who will enter into, and receive the Benefits of the

“ New Covenant, is absolutely required.

“ The other Parts of Divine Revelation

“ are Objects of Faith, and are so to be

“ received. They are Truths, whereof

“ none, that is once known to be such

“ [*i. e.* of Divine Revelation] may, or ought

“ to be disbelieved.”

And as for that other Saying of his, *That*

I will not suffer Men to look into Christianity;

I desire to know where that Christianity is lock'd up, which *I will not suffer*

Men to look into? My Christianity, I confess,

is contained in the written Word of God:

And that I am so far from hindring

any one to look into, that I every where

appeal to it; and have quoted so much of

it,

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 165

it, that the *Unmasker* complains of being overlaid with it, and tells me 'tis *tedious*. "All Divine Revelation, I say, p. 256, "257. requires the Obedience of Faith; "and that every one is to receive all the "Parts of it, with a Docility and Disposition prepared to embrace and assent to "all Truths coming from God; and submit his Mind to whatever shall appear "to him to bear that Character." I speak, in p. 257. of Mens *endeavouring* to understand it, and of their *interpreting* one Place by another. This, and the whole Design of my Book, shews that I think it every Christian's Duty to read, search, and study the Holy Scriptures; and make this their great Business: And yet the good *Unmasker*, in a Fit of Zeal, displays his Throat, and cries out, p. 59. *Hear, O ye Heavens, and give Ear, O Earth; judge whether this be not the Way to introduce Darknes and Ignorance into Christendom; whether this be not blinding of Mens Eyes, &c.* For this mighty *Pathos* ends not there. And all Things consider'd, I know not whether he had not Reason, in his want of Arguments, this Way to pour out his Concern. For neither the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, nor the Apostles Creed, nor any thing else, being with him the Faith of a Christian, *i. e.* sufficient to make a Christian; but just his

Set of Fundamental Articles (when he himself knows what they be :) In fine, nothing being Christianity but just his System, 'tis time to cry out, Help, Neighbours ! hold fast, Friends ! Knowledge, Religion, Christianity is gone, if this be once permitted, that the People should read and understand the Scripture for themselves, as God shall enlighten their Understandings in the Use of the Means ; and not be forced to depend upon me, and upon my chusing, and my Interpretation, for the necessary Points they are to believe to make them Christians. If I, the great *Unmasker*, have not the sole Power to decree what is, or is not Fundamental, and People be not bound to receive it for such, Faith and the Gospel are given up ; *Darkness* and *Barbarism* will be brought in upon us, by this *Writer's Contrivance*. For, *he is an underhand Factor for that Communion, which cries up Ignorance for the Mother of Devotion and Religion ; i. e. in plain English, for Popery*. For to this, and nothing else, tends all that Sputter he makes, in the Sections before mentioned.

I do not think there was ever a more thorough-pac'd Declaimer than our *Unmasker*. He leaves out nothing that he thinks will make an affrighted Noise in the Ears of his Orthodox Hearers, though all the Blame and Censure he pours out upon others,

others, light only on himself. For let me ask this zealous Upholder of Light and Knowledge, Does he think it reasonable that any one, who is not a Christian, should be suffer'd to be undisturb'd in his Parish? Nay, does he think fit that any such should live free from the *Last of the Magistrate*, or from the Persecution of the *Ecclesiastical Power*? He seems to talk with another Air, *p.* 65. In the next Place I ask, Whether any one is a Christian, who had not the Faith of a Christian? Thirdly, I ask, Whether he has the Faith of a Christian, who does not explicitly believe all the Fundamental Articles of Christianity? And to conclude, I ask him, Whether all those, that he has set down, are not Fundamental, necessary Articles? When the *Unmasker* has fairly answer'd these Questions, it will be seen who is for Popery; and the Ignorance and Tyranny that accompanies it.

The *Unmasker* is for making and imposing Articles of Faith: But he is for this Power in himself. He likes not Popery (which is nothing but the Tyranny and imposing upon Mens Understanding, Faith, and Consciences) in the Hands of the old Gentleman at *Rome*: But it would, he thinks, do admirably well in his own Hands. And who can blame him for it? Would not that be an excellent Way to

propagate *Light* and *Knowledge*, by tying up all Men to a Bundle of Articles of his own Culling? Or rather, to the Authority of Christ, and his Apostles residing in him? For he does not, nor ever will, give us a full View of Fundamentals of his Christianity: But, like the Church of *Rome*, to secure our Dependance, reserves to himself a Power of declaring others, and defining what is Matter of Faith, as he shall see Occasion.

Now therefore veil your Bonnets to the *Unmasker*, all you that have a mind to be Christians: Break not your Heads about the Scriptures, to examine what they require of you: Submit your Faith implicitly to the *Unmasker*, he will understand and find out the necessary Points for you to believe. Take them, just so many as he thinks fit to deliver them to you; this is the Way to be knowing Christians: But be sure ask not, whether those he is pleas'd to deliver be every one of them Fundamental, and all the Fundamental Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian: Such a *capricious* Question spoils all, overturns Christianity, which is intrusted to the *Unmasker's* sole keeping, to be dispensed out as he thinks fit. If you refuse an implicit Faith to him, he will presently find you have it for the Whore of *Babylon*; he will smell out P
pery

pery in it immediately: For he has a very shrewd Scent, and you will be discovered to be an *Underband Factor* for the Church of *Rome*.

But if the *Unmasker* were such an Enemy, as he pretends, to those *Factors*, I wonder he should, in what he has said concerning the Apostles Creed, so exactly jump with *Knot* the Jesuit. If any one doubt of this, I desire him to look into the fourth Chapter of *Knot's Charity Maintain'd*, and there he will see how well our *Unmasker* and that *Jesuit* agree in Argument; nay, and Expression too. But yet I do not think him so far guilty, as to be employed as an *Underband Factor* for Popery. Every body will, I suppose, be ready to pronounce him so far an Innocent, as to clear him from that. The Cunning of his Design goes not beyond the laying out of his preaching Oratory, for the setting up his own System, and making that the sole Christianity. To that End, he would be glad to have the Power of interpreting Scripture, of defining and declaring Articles of Faith, and imposing them. This, which makes the absolute Power of the Pope, he would not, I think, establish at *Rome*; but 'tis plain he would have it himself, if he could get it, for the Support of the Christianity of
his

his System. An implicit Faith, if he might have the Management of it, and the taking Fundamentals upon Trust from his Authority, would be of excellent Use. Such a Power, in his Hands, would spread *Truth* and *Knowledge* in the World; *i. e.* his own Orthodoxy, and Set of Opinions. But if a Man differs, nay, questions any thing of that, whether it be absolutely necessary to make one a Christian, 'tis immediately a *Contrivance* to let in Popery, and to bring *Darkness* and *Barbarism* into the *Christian World*. But I must tell the innocent *Unmasker*, whether he designs it or no, that if his calling his System the only Christianity, can bring the World to receive from him Articles of Faith of his own chusing, as Fundamentals necessary to be believed by all Men to make them Christians, which Christ and his Apostles did not propose to all Men to make them Christians; he does only set up *Popery* in another Guise, and lay the Foundations of *Ignorance*, *Darkness*, and *Barbarism*, in the *Christian World*: For all the *Ignorance* and *Blindness*, that Popery introduc'd, was only upon this Foundation. And if he does not see this (as there is reason to excuse his Innocence) 'twould be no hard Matter to demonstrate it, if that were at present the Question between us. But
there

there are a great many other Propositions to be proved by him, before we come to that new Matter of Debate.

But before I quit these Paragraphs, I must go on with our *Unmasker's* Account, and desire him to shew, where it is,

XXV. *That I make it my Business to beat Men off from taking notice of any Divine Truths?*

Next, where it is,

XXVI. *That I cry down all Articles of Christian Faith but one?*

Next, how it appears,

XXVII. *That I will not suffer Mankind to look into Christianity?*

Again, where it is,

XXVIII. *That I labour industriously to keep People in Ignorance; or tell them, That there is no Necessity of knowing any other Doctrines of the Bible?*

These, and several others of the like Strain, particularly concerning *One Article*, and the *Epistles* (which are his Common-Places)

Places) are to be found in his 59th and 60th *Pages*. And all this out of a Presumption, that his System is the only Christianity; and that if Men were not press'd and perswaded to receive that, just every Article of it, upon Pain of Damnation, Christianity would be lost; and not to do this, is to promote *Ignorance*, and ~~con-~~temn the Bible. But he fears where no Fear is. If his Orthodoxy be the Truth, and conformable to the Scriptures, the laying the Foundation only where our Saviour and his Apostles have laid it, will not overturn it. And to shew him that it is so, I desire him again to consider what I said in my *Vindication*, p. 267. which, because I do not remember he any where takes Notice of in his *Reply*, I will here offer again to his Consideration: “Con-
 “vince but Men of the Mission of Jesus
 “Christ; make them but see the Truth,
 “Simplicity, and Reasonableness of what
 “he himself hath taught, and requir'd to
 “be believed by his Followers; and you
 “need not doubt, but being once fully
 “perswaded of his Doctrine, and the Ad-
 “vantages which all Christians agree are
 “receiv'd by him, such Converts will not
 “lay by the Scriptures; but, by a constant
 “Reading and Study of them, will get all
 “the Light they can from this Divine Re-
 “velation, and nourish themselves up in
 “the

“the Words of Faith and good Doctrine,
“as *St. Paul* speaks to *Timothy*.”

If the Reading and Study of the Scripture were more press'd than it is, and Men were fairly sent to the Bible to find their Religion; and not the Bible put into their Hands only to find the Opinions of their peculiar Sect or Party, Christendom would have more Christians, and those that are, would be more knowing, and more in the right than they now are. That which hinders this is that select Bundle of Doctrines, which it has pleas'd every Sect to draw out of the Scriptures, or their own Inventions, with an Omission (and as our *Unmasker* would say, a *Contempt*) of all the rest. These *choice* Truths (as the *Unmasker* calls his) are to be the standing Orthodoxy of that Party, from which none of that Church must recede without the Forfeiture of their Christianity, and the Loss of eternal Life. But whilst People keep firm to these, they are in the Church, and the Way to Salvation; which in effect, what is it but to encourage Ignorance, Laziness, and Neglect of the Scriptures? For what need they be at the Pains of constantly reading the Bible, or perplex their Heads with considering and weighing what is there deliver'd; when believing as the Church believes, or saying after, or not
con-

contradicting their *Domine* or Teacher, serves the Turn?

Further, I desire it may be consider'd what Name that meer Mock-shew, of recommending to Men the Study of the Scripture, deserves; if, when they read it, they must understand it just as he (that would be, and they are too apt, contrary to the Command of Christ, to call their Master) tells them. If they find any thing in the Word of God, that leads them into Opinions he does not allow; if any thing they meet with in Holy Writ seems to them to thwart or shake the received Doctrines, the very proposing of their Doubts renders them suspected: Reasoning about them, and not acquiescing in what is said to them, is interpreted want of due Respect and Deference to the Authority of their Spiritual Guides; Disrepute and Censures follow: And if in pursuance of their own Light, they persist in what they think the Scripture teaches them, they are turn'd out of the Church, deliver'd to Satan, and no longer allow'd to be Christians. And is thus a sincere and rightly directed Study of the Scriptures, that Men may understand and profit thereby, encourag'd? This is the Consequence of Mens assuming to themselves a Power of declaring Fundamentals, *i. e.* of setting up a Christianity of

of their own making. For how else can they turn Men, of as unblameable Lives as others of their Members, out of the Church of Christ (for so they count their Communion) for Opinions, unless those Opinions were concluded inconsistent with Christianity? Thus Systems, the Inventions of Men, are turned into so many opposite Gospels; and nothing is Truth in each Sect, but what just suits with them. So that the Scripture serves but, like a Nose of Wax, to be turn'd and bent just as may fit the contrary Orthodoxies of different Societies. For 'tis these several Systems that to each Party are the just Standards of Truth, and the Meaning of the Scripture is to be measured only by them. Whoever relinquishes any of those distinguishing Points, immediately ceases to be a Christian.

This is the Way that the *Unmasker* would have Truth and Religion preserv'd, Light and Knowledge propagated. But here too the different Sects giving equal Authority to their own Orthodoxies, will be quits with him. For as far as I can observe, the same Genius seems to influence them all; even those who pretend most to Freedom, the *Socinians* themselves. For, when 'tis observ'd how positive and eager they are in their Disputes; how forward to have their Interpretations of Scripture receiv'd

I for

for Authentick, though to others in several places they seem very much strain'd; how impatient they are of Contradiction; and with what Disrespect and Roughness they often treat their Opposers; may it not be suspected that this so visible a Warmth in their present Circumstances, and Zeal for their Orthodoxy, would (had they the Power) work in them, as it does in others? They, in their Turns, would, I fear, be ready with their Set of Fundamentals; which they would be as forward to impose on others, as others have been to impose contrary Fundamentals on them.

This is, and always will be the unavoidable Effect of intruding on our Saviour's Authority, and requiring more now, as necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, than was at first requir'd by our Saviour and his Apostles. What else can be expected among Christians, but their tearing, and being torn in pieces by one another; whilst every Sect assumes to it self a Power of declaring Fundamentals, and severally thus narrow Christianity to their distinct Systems? He that has a mind to see how Fundamentals come to be fram'd and fashion'd, and upon what Motives and Considerations they are often taken up, or laid down, according to the Humours, Interests, or Designs of the Heads of Parties, as if they were Things depending on Mens Plea-

Pleasure, and to be suited to their Convenience, may find an Example worth his Notice, in the Life of Mr. *Baxter*, Part II. p. 197—205.

Whenever Men take upon them to go beyond those Fundamental Articles of Christianity, which are to be found in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles, where will they stop? Whenever any Set of Men will require more as necessary to be believ'd to make Men of their Church, *i.e.* in their Sense Christians, than what our Saviour and his Apostles propos'd to those whom they made Christians, and admitted into the Church of Christ; however they may pretend to recommend the Scripture to their People, in effect no more of it is recommended to them, than just comports with what the Leaders of that Sect have resolved Christianity shall consist in.

'Tis no wonder therefore there is so much Ignorance amongst Christians, and so much vain Outcry against it; whilst almost every distinct Society of Christians magisterially ascribes Orthodoxy to a select Set of Fundamentals, distinct from those propos'd in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles; which in no one Point must be question'd by any of its Communion. By this Means their People are never sent to the Holy Scriptures, that

N

true

true Fountain of Light, but hood-wink'd: A Veil is cast over their Eyes, and then they are bid read their Bible. They must make it all chime to their Church's Fundamentals, or else they were better let it alone. For if they find any thing there against the received Doctrines, though they hold it and express it in the very Terms the Holy Ghost has deliver'd it in, that will not excuse them. Heresy will be their Lot, and they shall be treated accordingly. And thus we see how, amongst other good Effects, Creed-making always has, and always will necessarily produce and propagate Ignorance in the World, however each Party blame others for it. And therefore I have often wondred to hear Men of several Churches so heartily exclaim against the implicit Faith of the Church of *Rome*; when the same implicit Faith is as much practis'd and required in their own, though not so openly profess'd, and ingenuously own'd there.

In the next Section, the *Unmasker* questions the Sincerity of mine, and professes the Greatness of his Concern *for the Salvation of Mens Souls*. And tells me of my *Reflection* on him upon that Account, in my *Vindication*, p. 267, 268. *Answ.* I wish he would, for the right Information of the Reader, every where set down, what he has any thing to say to in my
Book,

Book, or my Defence of it, and save me the Labour of repeating it. My Words, in that Place, are, "Some Men will not bear, that any one should speak of Religion, but according to the Model that they themselves have made of it. Nay, though he proposes it upon the very Terms, and in the very Words, which our Saviour and his Apostles preach'd it in; yet he shall not escape Censures and the severest Insinuations. To deviate in the least, or to omit any thing contain'd in their Articles, is Heresy, under the most invidious Names in fashion; and 'tis well if he escapes being a downright Atheist. Whether this be the Way for Teachers to make themselves hearken'd to as Men in Earnest in Religion, and really concern'd for the Salvation of Mens Souls, I leave them to consider. What Success it has had towards persuading Men of the Truth of Christianity, their own Complaints of the Prevalency of Atheism on the one Hand, and the Number of *Deists* on the other, sufficiently shew."

I have set down this Passage at large, both as a Confirmation of what I said but just now; as also to shew, that the *Reflection* I there made, needed some other Answer than a bare Profession of his *REGARD to the Salvation of Mens Souls*. The

Assuming an undue Authority to his own Opinions, and using manifest Untruths in the Defence of them, I am sure is no Mark that the directing Men right in the Way to Salvation is his chief Aim. And I wish, that the greater Liberties of that Sort, which he has again taken in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, and which I have so often laid open, had not confirm'd that *Reflection*. I should have been glad, that any thing in my Book had been fairly controverted, and brought to the Touch, whether it had or had not been confuted. The Matter of it would have deserv'd a serious Debate (if any had been necessary) in the Words of Sobriety, and the charitable Temper of the Gospel, as I desir'd in my Preface : And that would not have mis-become the *Unmasker's* Function. But it did not consist, it seems, with his Design. Christian Charity would not have allow'd those ill-meant Conjectures, and groundless Censures, which were necessary to his Purpose ; and therefore he took a shorter Course, than to confute my Book, and thereby convince me and others. He makes it his Business to rail at it, and the Author of it, that that might be taken for a Confutation. For by what he has hitherto done, Arguing seems not to be his Talent. And thus far who can but allow his Wisdom ? But whether it be that *Wisdom*

dom that is from above; first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of Mercy, and good Fruits, without Partiality, and without Hypocrisy; I shall leave to other Readers to judge.

His saying nothing to that other *Reflection*, which his Manner of expressing himself drew from me, would make one suspect it favour'd not altogether of the Wisdom of the Gospel; nor shew'd an over-great Care of the Salvation of Souls. My Words, *Vindic.* p. 281. are: " I know
" not how better to shew my Care of his
" Credit, than by intreating him, that
" when he takes next in hand such a Sub-
" ject as this, wherein the Salvation of
" Souls is concerned, he would treat it a
" little more seriously, and with a little
" more Candour, lest Men should find in
" his Writings another Cause of Atheism,
" which in this Treatise he has not thought
" fit to mention. *Ostentation of Wit* in
" general he has made a Cause of Atheism,
" p. 28. But the World will tell him,
" That frothy light Discourses, concern-
" ing the serious Matters of Religion, and
" *Ostentation* of trifling mis-becoming
" Wit in those who come as Ambassadors
" from God, under the Title of Succes-
" sors of the Apostles in the great Com-
" mission of the Gospel, is none of the
" least Causes of Atheism," But this Ad-

vice I am now satisfied (by his Second Part of the same Strain) was very improper for him ; and no more reasonable, than if one should advise a Buffoon to talk gravely, who has nothing left to draw Attention, if he should lay by his Scurrility.

The Remainder of this fourth Chapter, p. 61—67. being spent in shewing, why the *Socinians* are for a few Articles of Faith, being a Matter that I am not concern'd in ; I leave to that forward Gentleman to examine, who examin'd Mr. *Edwards's* Exceptions against the *Reasonableness of Christianity* ; and who, as the *Unmasker* informs me, p. 64. was *chosen to vindicate my Attempt, &c.*

If the *Unmasker* knows that he was so *chosen*, it is well. If I had known of such a Choice, I should have desir'd that some body should have been *chosen to vindicate my Attempt*, who had understood it better. The *Unmasker* and *Examiner* are each of them so full of themselves, and their own Systems, that I think they may be a fit Match one for another : And so I leave these Cocks of the Game to try it out in an endless Battle of Wrangling (till Death them part) which of them has made the true and exact Collection of Fundamentals ; and whose System of the two ought to be the prevailing Orthodoxy, and be receiv'd for Scripture. Only I warn the *Ex-*
aminer

aminer to look to himself: For the *Unmasker* has the whip-hand of him, and gives him to understand, *p.* 65. that if he cannot do it himself by the Strength of his Lungs, the Vehemency of his Oratory, and endless Attacks of his Repetitions; the *Ecclesiastical Power*, and the *Civil Magistrate's Lash*, have in Store demonstrative Arguments to convince him that his [the *Unmasker's*] System is the only true Christianity.

By the Way, I must not forget to mind the *Unmasker* here again, that he hath a very unlucky Hand at gueffing. For whereas he names *Socinus* as one from whom I receiv'd my *Platform*, and says, that *Crellius* gave me my Cue; it so falls out, that they are two Authors of whom I never read a Page. I say not this, as if I thought it a Fault if I had; for I think I should have much better spent my Time in them, than in the Writings of our learned *Unmasker*.

I was sure there was no offending the *Unmasker* without the Guilt of *Atheism*; only he here, *p.* 69. very mercifully lays it upon my Book, and not upon my Design. The *Tendency of it to Irreligion and Atheism*, he has proved in an eloquent Harangue (for he is such an Orator he cannot stir a Foot without a Speech) made, as he bids us suppose, by the *Atheistical*

Rabble. And who can deny, but he has chose a fit Employment for himself? Where could there be found a better Speech-maker for the *Atheistical Rabble*? But let us hear him: For though he would give the *Atheistical Rabble* the Credit of it, yet 'tis the *Unmasker* speaks. And, because 'tis pity such a Pattern of Rhetorick and Reason should be lost, I have, for my Reader's Edification, set it all down *verbatim*.

“ We are beholden to this worthy Ad-
“ venturer for ridding the World of so
“ great an Incumbrance, *viz.* That huge
“ Mass and unwieldy Body of Christia-
“ nity, which took up so much Room.
“ Now we see that it was this Bulk, and
“ not that of Mankind, which he had an
“ Eye to, when he so often mention'd this
“ latter. This is a Physician for our turn
“ indeed: We like this Chymical Opera-
“ tor, that doth not trouble us with a
“ Parcel of heavy Drugs of no Value,
“ but contracts it all into a few Spirits,
“ nay doth his Business with a single Drop.
“ We have been in Bondage a long time
“ to Creeds and Catechisms, Systems and
“ Confessions; we have been plagu'd with
“ a tedious Bead-roll of Articles, which
“ our Reverend Divines have told us we
“ must make the Matter of our Faith.
“ Yea, so it is, both Conformists and
“ Non-

“ Non-conformists (though disagreeing in
“ some other Things) have agreed in this
“ to molest and crucify us. But this noble
“ Writer (we thank him) hath set us free,
“ and eas’d us, by bringing down all the
“ Christian Faith into one Point. We
“ have heard some Men talk of Episto-
“ lary Composures of the New Testa-
“ ment, as if great Matters were contain’d
“ in them, as if the great Mysteries of
“ Christianity (as they call them) were
“ unfolded there: But we could never
“ make any thing of them; and now we
“ find that this Writer is partly of our
“ Opinion. He tells us, that these are
“ Letters sent upon Occasion, but we are
“ not to look for our Religion (for now
“ for this Gentleman’s sake we begin to
“ talk of Religion) in these Places. We
“ believe it, and we believe that there is
“ no Religion but in those very *Chapters*
“ and *Verses*, which he has set down in
“ his Treatise. What need we have any
“ other Part of the *New Testament*? That
“ is Bible enough, if not too much. Hap-
“ py, thrice happy shall this Author be
“ perpetually esteem’d by us, we will
“ chronicle him as our Friend and Bene-
“ factor. It is not our Way to saint Peo-
“ ple, otherwise we would certainly cano-
“ nize this Gentleman; and when our
“ Hand

“ Hand is in, his pair of Booksellers, for
 “ their being so beneficial to the World,
 “ in publishing so rich a Treasure. It
 “ was a blessed Day when this hopeful
 “ Birth saw the Light ; for hereby all the
 “ Orthodox Creed-Makers and Systema-
 “ tick Men are ruin’d for ever. In brief,
 “ if we be for any Christianity, it shall be
 “ this Author’s ; for that agrees with us
 “ singularly well, it being so short, all
 “ couch’d in four Words, neither more
 “ nor less. It is a very fine Compendium,
 “ and we are infinitely oblig’d to this great
 “ Reformer for it. We are glad at heart
 “ that Christianity is brought so low by
 “ this worthy Pen-man, for this is a good
 “ Presage that it will dwindle into no-
 “ thing. What ! but one Article, and
 “ that so brief too ! We like such a Faith,
 “ and such a Religion, because it is so near
 “ to none.”

He hath no sooner done, but as it de-
 served, he cries out, *Euge Sophos ! And is*
not the Reader, quoth he, satisfy’d that
such Language as this bath real Truth in
it ? Does not he perceive, that the discar-
ding all the Articles but ONE makes way
for the casting off that too ? Answ. ’Tis
 but supposing that the Reader is a civil
 Gentleman, and answers *Yes* to these two
 Questions ; and then ’tis Demonstration,
 that

that by this Speech he has irrefragably prov'd the *Tendency* of my Book to *Irreligion and Atheism*.

I remember *Chillingworth* somewhere puts up this Request to his Adversary *Knot* : " Sir, I beseech you, when you
" write again, do us the Favour to write
" nothing but Syllogisms. For I find it
" still an extreme Trouble to find out the
" conceal'd Propositions, which are to
" connect the Parts of your Enthymems.
" As now for Example, I profess to you
" I have done my best Endeavour to find
" some Glue, or Sodder, or Cement, or
" Thred, or any thing to tie the Antecedent and this Consequent together."

The *Unmasker* agrees so much in a great Part of his Opinion with that Jesuit (as I have shewed already) and does so infinitely out-do him in spinning Ropes of Sand, and a coarse Thred of Inconsistencies, which runs quite through his Book ; that 'tis with great Justice I put him here in the Jesuit's Place, and address the same Request to him.

His very next Words give me a fresh Reason to do it : For thus he argues, *p.* 72.
May we not expect, that those who deal thus with the Creed, i. e. discard all the Articles of it but one, will use the same Method in reducing the Ten Coommandments and the Lord's Prayer, abbreviate the former

mer into one Precept, and the latter into one Petition? *Ans.* If he will tell me where this *Creed* he speaks of is, it will be much more easy to answer his Demand. Whilst his *Creed*, which he here speaks of, is yet no where, it is ridiculous for him to ask Questions about it. The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, I know where to find, in express Words set down by themselves, with peculiar Marks of Distinction. Which is the Lord's Prayer, we are plainly taught by this Command of our Saviour, *Luke xi. 2. When ye pray, SAY, Our Father, &c.* In the same Manner and Words we are taught what we should believe, to make us his Disciples, by his Command to the Apostles what they should preach, *Matt. x. 7. As ye go, preach, SAYING.* What were they to say? Only this, *The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand.* Or, as St. Luke expresses it, *Chap. ix. 2. They were sent to preach the Kingdom of God, and to heal the Sick:* Which, what it was, we have sufficiently explain'd. But this *Creed* of the *Unmasker*, which he talks of, Where is it? Let him shew it us distinctly set out from the rest of the Scripture. If he knows where it is, let him produce it, or leave talking of it, till he can. 'Tis not the Apostles Creed, that's evident: For that Creed he has *discarded* from being the Standard of Christian

Christian Faith, and has told the World in Words at length, That *if a Man* believes *no more than is in express Terms in the Apostles Creed, his Faith will not be the Faith of a Christian.* Nay, 'tis plain, that Creed has, in the *Unmasker's* Opinion, the same *Tendency to Atheism and Irreligion*, that my Summary has. For the Apostles Creed reducing the Forty, or perhaps four Hundred Fundamental Articles of his Christian Creed, to Twelve; and leaving out the greatest Part of those necessary ones which he has already, and will hereafter, in good time, give us; does as much dispose Men to serve the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer just so, as my reducing those Twelve to Two. For so many at least he has granted to be in my Summary, *viz.* The Article of one God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and the other of Jesus the Messiah; though he every where calls them but *ONE*: Which, whether it be to shew, with what Love and Regard to Truth he continues, and consequently began this Controversy; or whether it be to beguile and startle unwary, or confirm prejudic'd Readers, I shall leave to others to judge. 'Tis evident, he thinks his Cause would be mightily maim'd, if he were forc'd to leave out the Charge of *ONE* Article; and he would not know what to do for Wit or Argument, if he should

should call them *two* : For then the whole Weight and Edge of his strong and sharp Reasoning, in his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 122. would be lost. There you have it in these Words : *When the Catholick Faith is thus brought down to one single Article, it will soon be reduc'd to none ; the Unite will dwindle into a Cypber.* And here again, it makes the whole Argument of his Atheistical Speech, which he winds up with these convincing Words : *We are glad to hear that Christianity is brought so low by this worthy Pen-man ; for this is a good Presage, that it will dwindle into nothing. What ! ONE Article, and that so brief too : We like such a Faith, and such a Religion, because it is so near NONE.* But I must tell this Writer of equal Wit, Sense, and Modesty, that this Religion which he thus makes a dull Farce of, and calls *near none*, is that very Religion which our Saviour *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles preach'd, for the Conversion and Salvation of Mankind ; no one Article whereof, which they proposed as necessary to be received by Unbelievers to make them Christians, is omitted. And I ask him, Whether it be his Errand, as one of our Saviour's Ambassadors, to turn it thus into Ridicule ? For till he has shewn, that they preach'd otherwise, and more than what the Spirit of Truth has re-

recorded of their Preaching in their Histories, which I have faithfully collected and set down, all that he shall say, reflecting upon the Plainness and Simplicity of their Doctrine, however directed against me, will, by his *Atheistical Rabble* of all kinds, now they are so well enter'd and instructed in it by him, be all turn'd upon our Saviour and his Apostles.

What Tendency this, and all his other Trifling in so serious a Cause as this is, has to the propagating of *Atheism and Irreligion* in this Age, he were best to consider. This I am sure, the Doctrine of but *one* Article (if the Author and Finisher of our Faith, and those he guided by his Spirit, had preach'd but *one* Article) has no more Tendency to Atheism, than their Doctrine of *one* God. But the *Unmasker* every where talks as if the Strength of our Religion lay in the Number of its Articles; and would be presently routed, if it had but a few: And therefore he has muster'd up a pretty full Band of them, and has a Reserve of the Lord knows how many more, which shall be forth-coming upon Occasion. But I shall desire to mind this learned Divine, who is so afraid what will become of his Religion, if it should propose but *one*, or a few Articles, as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, that the Strength and Security of
our

our Religion lies in the divine Authority of those who first promulgated the Terms of Admittance into the Church; and not in the Multitude of Articles, suppos'd by some necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian: And I would have him remember, when he goes next to make use of this strong Argument of *ONE dwindling into a Cypher*, that *One* is as remote as a Million from none. And if this be not so, I desire to know whether his Way of arguing will not prove Pagan Polytheism to be more remote from Atheism than Christianity. He will do well to try the Force of his Speech in the Mouth of an Heathen, complaining of the Tendency of *Christianity* to Atheism, by reducing his great Number of Gods to but *one*, which was *so near none*, and would therefore *soon be reduc'd to none*.

The *Unmasker* seems to be upon the same Topick, where he so pathetically complains of the *Socinians*, p. 66. in these Words: *Is it not enough to rob us of our God, by denying Christ to be so; but must they spoil us of all the other Articles of Christian Faith but one?* Have a better Heart, good Sir; for I assure you no body can rob you of your God, but by your own Consent, nor spoil you of any of the *Articles* of your Faith. If you look for them where God has placed them, in the Holy
Scrip-

Scripture, and take them as he has fram'd and fashion'd them there; there you will always find them safe and sound. But if they come out of an Artificer's Shop, and be of human Invention, I cannot answer for them: They may, for ought I know, be nothing but an Idol of your own setting up; which may be pull'd down, should you cry out ever so much, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians!*

He who considers this Argument of *one* and *none*, as managed by the *Unmasker*, and observes his pathological Way of Reasoning all through his Book, must confess that he has got the very Philosopher's Stone in disputing. That which would be worthless Lead in others, he turns into pure Gold; his Oratory changes its Nature, and gives it the noble Tincture: So that what in plain Reasoning would be Nonsense, let him but put it into a Speech or an Exclamation, and there it becomes strong Argument. Whether this be not so, I desire *Mode* and *Figure* may decide. And to those I shall desire he would reduce the Proofs, which, *p.* 73. he says he has given of these following Propositions, *viz.*

XXIX. *That I have corrupted Mens Minds.*

O

XXX. *That*

XXX. *That I have depraved the Gospel.*

XXXI. *That I have abused Christianity.*

For all these Three, p. 73. he affirms of me without Proof, and without Honesty.

Whether it be from Confusion of Thought, or Unfairness of Design; either because he has not clear, distinct Notions of what he would say, or finds it not to his Purpose to speak them clearly out, or both together; so it is, that the *Unmasker* very seldom, but when he rails, delivers himself so, that one can certainly tell what he would have.

The Question is, What is absolutely necessary to be believed, by every one, to make him a Christian? It has been clearly made out, from an exact Survey of the History of our Saviour and his Apostles, that the whole Aim of all their Preaching, every where, was to convince the unbelieving World of these two great Truths: First, That there was one Eternal, Invisible God, Maker of Heaven and Earth: And next, That *Jesus of Nazareth* was the *Messiah*, the promised King and Saviour; and that upon Mens believing these two Articles, they were baptized and admitted into the Church, *i. e.* received as Subjects

Subjects of Christ's Kingdom, and pronounced Believers. From whence it unavoidably follows, that these two are the only Truths necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

This Matter of Fact is so evident from the whole Tenor of the four Gospels and the *Acts*, and presses so hard, that the *Unmasker*, who contends for a great Number of other Points necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, thinks himself concerned to give some Answer to it ; but, in his usual Way, full of Uncertainty and Confusion. To clear this Matter, he lays down four Particulars.

The First is, *p. 74. That the believing Jesus to be the promised Messiah, was the first Step to Christianity.*

The Second, *p. 76. That though this one Proposition (viz. of Jesus the Messiah) be mentioned alone in some Places, yet there is reason to think, and be persuaded, that at the same Time other Matters of Faith were proposed.*

The Third, *p. 76. That though there are several Parts and Members of the Christian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one Place of Scripture.*

The Fourth, *p. 78. That Christianity was erected by degrees.*

These Particulars he tells us, *p. 74.* *he offers to clear an Objection.* To see therefore whether they are pertinent or no, we must examine what the Objection is, as he puts it. I think it might have been put in a few Words: This I am sure, it ought to have been put very clear and distinct. But the *Unmasker* has been pleased to give it us, *p. 73.* as followeth: *Because I designed these Papers for the satisfying of the Reader's Doubts, about any thing occurring concerning the Matter before us, and for the establishing of his wavering Mind; I will here (before I pass to the Second General Head of my Discourse) answer a Query or Objection, which some, and not without some shew of Ground, may be apt to start. How comes it to pass, they will say, that this Article of Faith, viz. That Jesus is the Messiah, or Christ, is so often repeated in the New Testament? Why is this sometimes urged, without the mentioning of any other Article of Belief? Doth not this plainly shew, that this is all that is required to be believed, as necessary to make a Man a Christian? May we not infer, from the frequent and sole Repetition of this Article in several Places of the Evangelists and the Acts, that there is no other Point of Faith of absolute Necessity; but that this alone is sufficient to constitute a Man a true Member of Christ.*

By

By which he shews, that he is uncertain which way to put the Objection, so as may be easiest to get rid of it: And therefore he has turned it several Ways, and put several Questions about it. As first,

Why this Article of Faith, viz. That Jesus is the Messiah, is so often repeated in the New Testament?

His next Question is, *Why is this sometimes urged without the mentioning any other Article of Belief?* Which supposes that sometimes other Articles of Belief are mentioned with it.

The third Question is, *May we not infer from the frequent and sole Repetition of this Article, in several Places of the Evangelists and Acts?*

Which last Question is, in effect, *Why is this so frequently and alone repeated in the Evangelists and the Acts? i. e. in the preachings of our Saviour, and his Apostles, to Unbelievers?* For of that he must give an Account, if he will remove the Difficulty. Which three, though put as one, yet are three as distinct Questions, and demand a Reason for three as distinct Matters of Fact as these three are, *viz. frequently propos'd; sometimes propos'd alone; and always propos'd alone, in the preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles:* For so in truth it was all through the *Gospels*

198 *A Second Vindication of the*
and the *Acts*, to the unconverted Believers
of one God *alone*.

These three Questions being thus jumbld together in one Objection, let us see how the four Particulars he mentions will account for them.

The first of them is this : *The believing Jesus to be the promis'd Messias*, was, says he, *the first Step to Christianity*. Let it be so: What do you infer from thence? The next Words shew : *Therefore this, rather than any other Article, was propounded to be believed by all those, whom either our Saviour or his Apostles invited to embrace Christianity*. Let your Premises be never so true, and your Deduction of this Proposition be never so regular from them, it is all lost Labour. This Conclusion is not the Proposition you were to prove. Your Questions were, *Why this Article is so often propos'd?* And in those frequent Repetitions, *Why sometimes urged alone; and why always propos'd alone, viz. to those whom either our Saviour or his Apostles invited to embrace Christianity?* And your Answer is, because the believing *Jesus to be the Messias, was the first Step to Christianity*. This therefore remains upon you to be proved,

XXXII. *That because the believing Jesus to be the Messias, is the first Step to*
Chri-

Christianity; therefore this Article is frequently propos'd in the New Testament; is sometimes propos'd without the mentioning any other Article, and always alone to Unbelievers.

And when you have prov'd this, I shall desire you to apply it to your present Controversy.

His next Answer to those Questions, is in these Words, p. 76. *That though this one Proposition or Article be mentioned alone in some Places; yet there is reason to think, and be persuaded, that at the same time other Matters of Faith were propos'd. From whence it lies upon him to make out this Reasoning, viz.*

XXXIII. *That because there is Reason to think, and be persuaded, that at the same Time that this one Article was mentioned alone (as it was sometimes) other Matters of Faith were propos'd; therefore this Article was often propos'd in the New Testament; sometimes propos'd alone; and always propos'd alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to Unbelievers.*

This I set down to shew the Force of his Answer to Questions: Supposing it to

be true, not that I grant it to be true, That where *this one Article is mentioned alone, we have reason to think, and be persuaded, that at the same Time other Matters of Faith* [*i. e.* Articles of Faith necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian] *were propos'd: And I doubt not but to shew the contrary.*

His third Particular, in answer to the Question propos'd in his Objection, stands thus, *p. 76. That though there are several Parts and Members of the Christian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one Place of the Scripture.* Which Answer lays it upon him to prove,

XXXIV. That because *the several Parts or Members of the Christian Faith do not all occur in any one Place of Scripture; therefore this Article, That Jesus was the Messias, was often propos'd in the New Testament; sometimes propos'd alone, and always propos'd alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles, through the History of the Evangelists and the Acts.*



The fourth and last Particular, which he tells us is the main Answer to the Objection, is in these Words, *p. 78.*

That Christianity was erected by Degrees.
Which

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 201
Which requires him to make out this
Argument, viz.

XXXV. *That because Christianity was erected by Degrees, therefore this Article, That Jesus was the Messias, was often propos'd in the New Testament; sometimes proposed alone, and always proposed alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to Unbelievers, recorded in the History of the Evangelists and Acts.*

For, as I said before, in these three Questions he has put his Objection: To which he tells us this is the main Answer.

Of these four Particulars it is, that he says, p. 74. *To clear this Objection, and to give a full and satisfactory Answer to all Doubts in this Affair, I offer these ensuing Particulars; which will lead the Reader to the right Understanding of the whole Case.*

How well they have cleared the Objection, may be seen by barely setting them down as Answers to these Questions, wherein he puts the Objection.

This is all I have hitherto done: Whereby is very visible how well (supposing them true) they clear the Objection; and how pertinently they are brought to answer
those

those Questions, wherein his Objection is contain'd. Perhaps it will be said, that neither these, nor any thing else, can be an apposite Answer to those Questions put so together. I answer, I am of the same Mind. But if the *Unmasker*, through Ignorance or Shuffling, will talk thus confusedly, he must answer for it. He calls all his three Questions one Objection, over and over again: And therefore which of those Questions it does, or does not lie in, I shall not trouble my self to divine; since I think he himself cannot tell: For which ever he takes of them, it will involve him in equal Difficulties. I now proceed to examine his Particulars themselves, and the Truth contained in them. The first, p. 74. stands thus:

1. *The believing of Jesus to be the promis'd Messias, was the first Step to Christianity. It was that which made way for the embracing of all the other Articles, a Passage to all the rest.* *Ans.* If this be, as he would have it, only the leading Article, amongst a great many other, equally necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; this is a Reason, why it should be constantly preach'd in the first Place. But this is no Reason why this alone should be so often repeated, and the other necessary Points not be once mentioned. For I desire to know what those Articles are, that

that in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles are repeated or urg'd besides this?

In the next Place, if it be true, that this Article, *viz.* That *Jesus* is the *Messiah*, was only the first in Order amongst a great many Articles as necessary to be believ'd; how comes it to pass, that barely upon the Proposal and Believing of this, Men were admitted into the Church as Believers? The History of the *New Testament* is full of Instances of this; as *Acts* viii. 5, 12, 13. ix. and in other Places.

Though it be true, what the *Unmasker* says here, *That if they did not give Credit to this in the first Place, that Jesus of Nazareth was that eminent and extraordinary Person prophesied of long before, and that he was sent and commissioned by God, there could be no hope that they would attend to any other Proposals relating to the Christian Religion; yet what he subjoins, that this is the true Reason why that Article was constantly propounded to be believ'd by all that look'd towards Christianity, and why it is mentioned so often in the Evangelical Writings, is not true.* For, First, this supposes that there were other Articles join'd with it. This he should have first proved, and then given the Reason of it; and not, as he does here, suppose what is in question, and then give a Reason why it is so; and

and such a Reason that is inconsistent with the Matter of Fact, that is every where recorded in Holy Writ. For if the true Reason why the preaching of this Article, that *Jesus was the Messiah*, as it is recorded in the History of the *New Testament*, were only to make way for the other Articles, one must needs think, that either our Saviour and his Apostles (with Reverence be it spoken) were very strange Preachers; or that the Evangelists, and Author of the *Acts*, were very strange Historians. The first were to instruct the World in a new Religion, consisting of a great Number of Articles, says the *Unmasker*, necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian; *i. e.* a great Number of Propositions making a large System, every one whereof is so necessary for a Man to understand and believe, that if any one be omitted, he cannot be of that Religion. What now did our Saviour and his Apostles do? Why, if the *Unmasker* may be believ'd, they went up and down with danger of their Lives, and preach'd to the World. What did they preach? Even this single Proposition, to make way for the rest, *viz. This is the eminent Man sent from God*, to teach you other Things: Which amounts to no more than this, That *Jesus* was the Person which was to teach them the true Religion, but that true Religion it self is not to be found
in

in all their Preaching; nay, scarce a Word of it. Can there be any thing more ridiculous than this? And yet this was all they preach'd; if it be true, that this was all which they meant by the Preaching every where *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*; and if it were only an Introduction, and a *making way* for the Doctrines of the Gospel. But it is plain it was call'd the Gospel it self. Let the *Unmasker*, as a true Successor of the Apostles, go and preach the Gospel, as the Apostles did, to some Part of the Heathen World, where the Name of Christ is not known: Would not he himself, and every body think he was very foolishly employed, if he should tell them nothing but this, that *Jesus* was the Person promis'd and sent from God to reveal the true Religion; but should teach them nothing of that true Religion, but this preliminary Article? Such the *Unmasker* makes all the Preaching, recorded in the *New Testament*, for the Conversion of the unbelieving World. He makes the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles to be no more but this; That the great Prophet promised to the World was come, and that *Jesus* was he: But what his Doctrine was, that they were silent in, and taught not one Article of it. But the *Unmasker* misrepresents it: For as to his accusing the Historians, the Evangelists, and Wri-

ter of the *Acts* of the Apostles, for their shameful Omission of the whole Doctrine of the Christian Religion, to save his Hypothesis, as he does under his next Head, in these Words, *That though this one Proposition be mentioned alone in some Places, yet there is reason to think, and be persuaded, that at the same Time other Matters of Faith were propos'd*; I shall shew how bold he makes with those inspir'd Historians, when I come to consider that Particular.

How ridiculous, how senseless this bold *Unmasker*, and Reformer of the History of the *New Testament*, makes the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, as it stands recorded of them by infallible Writers, is visible. But taking it as in Truth it is there, we shall have a quite other View of it. Our Saviour preach'd every where the Kingdom of God, and by his Miracles declar'd himself to be the King of that Kingdom. The Apostles preach'd the same; and, after his Ascension, openly avow'd him to be the Prince and Saviour promis'd: but preach'd not this as a bare speculative Article of simple Belief; but that Men might receive him for their King, and become his Subjects. When they told the World that he was the Christ, it was not as the *Unmasker* will have it, Believe this Man to be a Prophet, and then he will teach you his new Religion; which
when

when you have receiv'd, and embrac'd all and every Article thereof, which are a great Number, you will then be Christians, if you be not ignorant or incredulous of any of them: But it was, Believe this Man to be your King, sent from God: Take him for such, with a Resolution to observe the Laws he has given you, and you are his Subjects; you are Christians. For those that truly did so, made themselves his Subjects: And to continue so, there was no more required than a sincere Endeavour to know his Will in all Things, and to obey it. Such a Preaching as this, of *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, the King and Deliverer, that God Almighty had promised to Mankind, and now had effectually sent to be their Prince and Ruler, was not a simple Preparation to the Gospel: But when received with the Obedience of Faith, was the very receiving of the Gospel; and had all that was requisite to make Men Christians. And without it be so understood, no body can clear the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles from that incredible Imperfection; or their Historians from that unpardonable Negligence, and not doing either what they ought, or what they undertook; which our *Unmasker* hath so impiously charged upon them, as will appear yet plainer in what I have to say to the *Unmasker's*

208 *A Second Vindication of the*
masker's next Particular. For as to the
Remainder of this Paragraph, it contains
nothing but his Censure and Contempt of
me, for not being of his Mind, for not
seeing as he sees; *i. e.* in effect, not laying
that Blame which he does, either on the
Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles,
or on the inspired Writings of their Histo-
rians, to make them comply with his
System, and the Christianity he would
make.

The *Unmasker's* second Particular, *p. 76.*
tells us, *That though this one Proposition or*
Article be mentioned alone in some Places,
yet there is Reason to think, and be per-
suaded, that at the same Time other Matters
of Faith were proposed. For it is confess'd,
by all intelligent and observing Men, that
the History of the Scripture is concise; and
that, in relating of Matter of Fact, many
Passages are omitted by the sacred Penmen.
Wherefore, though but this one Article of
Belief (because it is a leading one, and makes
way for the rest) be expressly mentioned in
some of the Gospels, yet we must not conclude
thence, that no other Matter of Faith was
requir'd to be admitted of: For Things are
briefly set down in the Evangelical Records,
and we must suppose many Things which are
not in direct Terms related.

Ans. The *Unmasker* here keeps to his
usual Custom of speaking in doubtful
Terms:

Terms: He says, that where this one Article, that *Jesus* is the *Messiah*, is alone recorded in the Preaching of our Saviour and Apostles; *We have Reason to be persuaded, that at the same Time other Matters of Faith were proposed.* If this be to his Purpose, by *Matters of Faith* must be meant Fundamental Articles of Faith, absolutely necessary to be believed by every Man to make him a Christian. That such *Matters of Faith* are omitted, in the History of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, by the sacred Historians; this, he says, *We have Reason to be persuaded of.*

Answ. They need be good Reasons to persuade a rational Man, that the Evangelists, in their History of our Saviour and his Apostles (if they were but ordinarily fair and prudent Men) did, in an History publish'd to instruct the World in a new Religion, leave out the necessary and fundamental Parts of that Religion. But let them be considered as inspired Writers, under the Conduct of the infallible Spirit of God, putting them upon and directing them in the Writing of this History of the Gospel; and then it is impossible for any Christian but the *Unmasker* to think, that they made any such gross Omissions, contrary to the Design of their Writing,

P

with-

without a Demonstration to convince him of it. Now all the Reason that the *Unmasker* gives, is this: *That it is confessed by all intelligent and observing Men, that the History of the Scripture is concise; and that in relating Matters of Fact, many Passages are omitted by the Sacred Pen-men.*

Ans. The *Unmasker* might have spar'd the Confession of *intelligent and observing Men*, after so plain a Declaration of St. *John* himself, *Chap. xx. 31. Many other Things did Jesus in the Presence of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book.* And again, *Ch. xxi. 25. There are also many other Things that Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose the World could not contain the Books that should be written.* There needs therefore no Opinion of *intelligent and observing Men* to convince us, that the History of the Gospel is so far concise, that a great many *Matters of Fact* are omitted, and a great many less material Circumstances, even of those that are set down. But will any *intelligent or observing Man*, any one that bears the Name of a Christian, have the Impudence to say, that the inspir'd Writers, in the Relation they give us of what Christ and his Apostles preached to Unbelievers to convert them to the Faith, omitted the Fundamental Articles which
those

those Preachers propos'd to make Men Christians ; and without a Belief of which they could not be Christians ?

The *Unmasker* talks after his wonted Fashion ; seems to say something, which when examin'd proves nothing to his Purpose. He tells us, *That in some Places, where the Article of Jesus the Messiah is mention'd alone, at the same Time other Matters of Faith were propos'd.* I ask, were these *other Matters of Faith* all the *Unmasker's* necessary Articles ? If not, what are those *other Matters of Faith* to the *Unmasker's* Purpose ? As for Example, in St. Peter's Sermon, *Acts ii. Other Matters of Faith were propos'd with the Article of Jesus the Messiah.* But what does this make for his Fundamental Articles ? Were they all propos'd with the Article of *Jesus the Messiah* ? If not, Unbelievers were converted and brought into the Church, without the *Unmasker's* necessary Articles. Three Thousand were added to the Church by this one Sermon. I pass by now St. Luke's not mentioning a Syllable of the greatest Part of the *Unmasker's* necessary Articles ; and shall consider only how long that Sermon may have been. 'Tis plain from *ver. 15.* that it began not till about Nine in the Morning ; and from *ver. 41.* that before Night Three Thousand were converted and baptiz'd. Now I ask the

Unmasker, Whether so small a Number of Hours as *St. Peter* must necessarily employ in preaching to them, were sufficient to instruct such a mix'd Multitude so fully in all those Articles, which he has propos'd as necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian; as that every one of those Three Thousand, that were that Day baptiz'd, did understand and explicitly believe every one of those his Articles, just in the Sense of our *Unmasker's* System? Not to mention those remaining Articles which the *Unmasker* will not be able in twice as many Months to find and declare to us.

He says, *That in some Places*, where the Article of *Jesus the Messiah* is mention'd alone, at the same Time other Matters of Faith were propos'd. Let us take this for so at present, yet this helps not the *Unmasker's* Case. The Fundamental Articles, that were propos'd by our Saviour and his Apostles, necessary to be believ'd to make Men Christians, are not set down; but only this single one of *Jesus the Messiah*: Therefore will any one dare to say they are omitted every where by the Evangelists? Did the Historians of the Gospel make their Relation so concise and short, that giving an Account in so many Places of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles for the Conversion of the unbelieving

lieving World, they did not in any one Place, nor in all of them together, set down the necessary Points of that Faith, which their unbelieving Hearers were converted to? If they did not, how can their Histories be call'd the Gospels of *Jesus Christ*? Or, how can they serve to the End for which they were written? Which was, to publish to the World the Doctrine of *Jesus Christ*, that Men might be brought into his Religion. Now I challenge the *Unmasker* to shew me, not out of any one Place, but out of all the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles, recorded in the Four Gospels, and the Acts, all those Propositions which he has reckon'd up as Fundamental Articles of Faith. If they are not to be found there, 'tis plain that either they are not Articles of Faith necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian; or else, that those inspir'd Writers have given us an Account of the Gospel, or Christian Religion, wherein the greatest Part of the Doctrines necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, are wholly omitted: Which in short is to say, that the Christianity, which is recorded in the Gospels and the Acts, is not that Christianity which is sufficient to make a Man a Christian. This (as absurd and impious as it is) is what our *Unmasker* charges upon the *Conciseness* (as

he is pleased to call it) of the Evangelical History. And this we must take upon his Word, though these inspired Writers tell us the direct contrary. For St. *Luke*, in his Preface to his Gospel, tells *Theophilus*, that having a perfect Knowledge OF *ALL THINGS*, the Design of his Writing was to set them in Order, that he might know the Certainty of those Things, that were believed amongst Christians. And his History of the *Acts* begins thus, *The former Treatise* [i. e. his Gospel] *have I made, O Theophilus, of ALL that Jesus began to do and to teach.* So that how concise soever the *Unmasker* will have his History to be, he professes it to contain *ALL* that *Jesus taught.* Which *ALL* must, in the narrowest Sense that can be given it, contain at least *all* Things necessary to make a Man a Christian. 'Twould else be a very lame and imperfect History of *ALL* that *Jesus taught*; if the Faith contained in it were not sufficient to make a Man a Christian. This, indeed, as the *Unmasker* hath been pleased to term it, would be a very *lank Faith*, a very *lank Gospel.*

St. *John* also says thus of his History of the Gospel, *Chap. xx. 30, 31. Many other Signs truly did Jesus in the Presence of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book*; So far his History is, by his own
Con-

Confession, *concise*. But *these*, says he, are written, that ye might believe, that *Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have Life through his Name*. As *concise* as it was, there was yet (if the Apostle's Word may be taken for it against the *Unmasker's*) enough contained in his Gospel for the procuring of eternal Life to those who believed it. And whether it was that one Article that he there sets down, *viz.* That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, or that Set of Articles which the *Unmasker* gives us, I shall leave to this modern Divine to resolve. And if he thinks still, that all the Articles he has set down in his Roll, are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, I must desire him to shew them to me in St. *John's* Gospel; or else to convince the World, that St. *John* was mistaken, when he said, that he had written his Gospel, that Men might believe that *Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God; and that believing they might have Life through his Name*.

So that granting the *History of the Scripture* to be so *concise* as the *Unmasker* would have it, *viz.* That in *some Places* the infallible Writers, recording the Discourses of our Saviour and his Apostles, omitted all the other Fundamental Articles, proposed by them to be believed to make Men Christians, but this one, that *Jesus* was the

Messiah; yet this will not remove the Objection that lies against his other Fundamentals, which are not to be found in the Histories of the Four Evangelists; nay, not to be found in every one of them. If every one of them contains the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and consequently all Things necessary to Salvation, whether this will not be a new Ground of Accusation against me, and give the *Unmasker* a Right to charge me with laying by three of the Gospels with *Contempt*, as well as he did before charge me with a *Contempt* of the Epistles, must be left to his sovereign Authority to determine.

Having shew'd, that allowing all he says here to be as he would have it, yet it clears not the Objection that lies against his Fundamentals; I shall now examine what Truth there is in what he here pretends, viz. That though the one Article, that Jesus is the Messiah, be mention'd *alone in some Places*, yet we have Reason to be persuaded, from the Conciseness of the Scripture-History, that there were at the same Time joined with it other necessary Articles of Faith, in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles.

It is to be observ'd, that the *Unmasker* builds upon this false Supposition, that in *some Places* other necessary Articles of Faith, joined with that of *Jesus the Messiah*,

fiab, are by the Evangelists mention'd to be propos'd by our Saviour and his Apostles, as necessary to be believed to make those they preached to Christians. For his saying, that in some Places that *one necessary Article is mentioned alone*, implies, that in other Places it is not mention'd alone, but joined with other necessary Articles. But then it will remain upon him to shew,

XXXVI. *In what Place either of the Gospels or of the Acts, other Articles of Faith are join'd with this, and propos'd as necessary to be believed to make Men Christians.*

The *Unmasker*, 'tis probable, will tell us that the Article of Christ's Resurrection is sometimes join'd with this of the *Messiah*, as particularly in that first Sermon of St. Peter, Acts ii. by which there were three Thousand added to the Church at one Time. *Ans^w*. This Sermon well considered, will explain to us both the Preaching of the Apostles, what it was that they propos'd to their unbelieving Auditors to make them Christians ; and also the Manner of St. Luke's recording their Sermons. 'Tis true, that here are delivered by St. Peter many other *Matters of Faith*, besides that of *Jesus* being the *Messiah* : For
all

all that he said being of divine Authority, is *Matter of Faith*, and may not be disbelieved. The first Part of his Discourse is, to prove to the *Jews*, that what they had observed of extraordinary at that Time amongst the Disciples, who spake Variety of Tongues, did not proceed from Wine, but from the Holy Ghost: And that this was the Pouring out of the Spirit, prophesy'd of by the Prophet *Joel*. This is all *Matter of Faith*, and is written that it might be believed: But yet I think, that neither the *Unmasker*, nor any body else will say, that this is such a necessary Article of Faith, that no Man could, without an explicit Belief of it, be a Christian: Though being a Declaration of the Holy Ghost by *St. Peter*, it is so much a *Matter of Faith*, that no body to whom it is now proposed, can deny it and be a Christian. And thus all the Scripture of the *New Testament*, given by divine Inspiration, is *Matter of Faith*, and necessary to be believed by all Christians to whom it is proposed. But yet I do not think any so unreasonable as to say, that every Proposition in the *New Testament* is a fundamental Article of Faith, which is requir'd explicitly to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

Here now is a *Matter of Faith* join'd, in the same Sermon, with this fundamental

tal

tal Article, That *Jesus is the Messiah*; and reported by the Sacred Historian so at large, that it takes up a third Part of *St. Peter's* Sermon, recorded by *St. Luke*: And yet it is such a *Matter of Faith*, as is not contained in the *Unmasker's* Catalogue of necessary Articles. I must ask him then, whether *St. Luke* were so *concise* an Historian, that he would so at large set down a *Matter of Faith* proposed by *St. Peter*, that was not necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, and wholly leave out the very mention of all the *Unmasker's* additional necessary Articles, if indeed they were necessary to be believed to make Men Christians? I know not how any one could charge the Historian with greater Unfaithfulness, or greater Folly. But this the *Unmasker* sticks not at, to preserve to himself the Power of appointing what shall, and what shall not be *necessary* Articles; and of making his System the Christianity necessary, and only necessary to be receiv'd.

The next Thing that *St. Peter* proceeds to in this his Sermon, is, to declare to the unbelieving *Jews*, that *Jesus of Nazareth*, who had done Miracles amongst them, whom they had crucified and put to Death, and whom God had raised again from the Dead, was the *Messiah*.

Here

Here indeed our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection are mention'd: And if they were no where else recorded, are *Matters of Faith*; which, with all the rest of the *New Testament*, ought to be believ'd by every Christian to whom it is thus propos'd, as a Part of divine Revelation. But that these were not here propos'd to the unbelieving *Jews*, as the fundamental Articles, which St. *Peter* principally aimed at, and endeavour'd to convince them of, is evident from hence; that they are made use of as Arguments to persuade them of this fundamental Truth, viz. That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, whom they ought to take for their Lord and Ruler. For whatsoever is brought as an Argument to prove another Truth, cannot be thought to be the principal Thing aimed at in that Argumentation; tho' it may have so strong and immediate a Connection with the Conclusion, that you cannot deny it without denying even what is inferred from it, and is therefore the fitter to be an Argument to prove it. But that our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection, were used here as Arguments to persuade them into a Belief of this fundamental Article, That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, and not as Propositions of a new Faith they were to receive; is evident from hence, that St. *Peter* preach'd

here to those who knew the Death and Crucifixion of *Jesus* as well as he: And therefore these could not be propos'd to them as new Articles of Faith to be believ'd. But these Matters of Fact being what the *Jews* knew already, were a good Argument, join'd with his Resurrection, to convince them of that Truth, which he endeavour'd to give them a Belief of. And therefore he rightly inferr'd from these Facts joined together, this Conclusion, the believing whereof would make them Christians: *Therefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Christ.* To the making good this sole Proposition, his whole Discourse tended: This was the sole Truth he labour'd to convince them of; this the Faith he endeavour'd to bring them into; which as soon as they had receiv'd with Repentance, they were by Baptism admitted into the Church, and three Thousand at once made Christians.

Here St. *Luke's* own Confession, without that of *intelligent and observing Men*, which the *Unmasker* has recourse to, might have satisfy'd him again, that in relating Matters of Fact, many Passages are omitted by the sacred Pen-men. For, says St. *Luke* here, ver. 40. *And with many other Words*, which are not set down.

One would, at first Sight, wonder why the *Unmasker* neglects these demonstrative Authorities of the Holy Pen-men themselves, where they own their Omissions, to tell us, that it is *confess'd by all intelligent and observing Men, that in relating Matters of Fact, many Passages are omitted by the sacred Pen-men.* St. *John*, in what he says of his Gospel, directly professes large Omissions, and so does St. *Luke* here. But these Omissions would not serve the *Unmasker's* Turn; for they are directly against him and what he would have: And therefore he had Reason to pass them by. For St. *John*, in that Passage above-cited, *Chap. xx. 30, 31.* tells us, that how much soever he had left out of his History, he had inserted that, which was enough to be believ'd to eternal Life: *But these are written that ye might believe, and believing ye might have Life.* But this is not all he assures us of, *viz.* That he had recorded all that was necessary to be believ'd to eternal Life: But he, in express Words, tells us what is that *ALL* that is necessary to be believ'd to eternal Life; and for the Proof of which Proposition alone, he writ all the rest of the Gospel, *viz.* That *we might believe*: What? Even this; *That Jesus is the Christ the Son of God,* and that *believing this, we might have Life through his Name.*

This may serve for a Key to us, in reading the History of the *New Testament*; and shew us why this Article, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, is no where omitted, though a great Part of the Arguments used to convince Men of it; nay, very often the whole Discourse made to lead Men into the Belief of it, be intirely omitted. The Spirit of God directed them every where to set down the Article, which was absolutely necessary to be believ'd to make Men Christians; so that that could no ways be doubted of nor mistaken: But the Arguments and Evidences, which were to lead Men into this Faith, would be sufficient, if they were once found any where, though scatter'd here and there in those Writings, whereof that infallible Spirit was the Author. This preserv'd the Decorum us'd in all Histories, and avoided those continual large and unnecessary Repetitions, which our critical *Unmasker* might have called *tedious*, with juster Reason than he does the Repetition of this short Proposition, That *Jesus* is the *Messiah*; which I set down no oftener in my Book, than the Holy Ghost thought fit to insert in the History of the *New Testament*, as concise as it is. But this it seems to our nice *Unmasker*, is *tedious*, tedious and offensive. And if a Christian, and a Successor of the Apostles, cannot bear the
being

being so often told, what it was that our Saviour and his Apostles every where preach'd to the Believers of one God, though it be contain'd in one short Proposition; what Cause of Exception and Disgust would it have been to Heathen Readers, some whereof might perhaps have been as Critical as the *Unmasker*, if this sacred History had in every Page been filled with the repeated Discourses of the Apostles, all of them every where to the same Purpose, *viz.* to persuade Men to believe, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*? It was necessary even by the Laws of History, as often as their Preaching any where was mention'd, to tell to what Purpose they spoke; which being always to convince Men of this fundamental Truth, 'tis no Wonder we find it so often repeated. But the Arguments and Reasonings, with which this one Point is urged, are, as they ought to be, in most Places, left out. A constant Repetition of them had been superfluous, and consequently might justly have been blam'd as *tedious*. But there is enough recorded abundantly to convince any rational Man, any one not wilfully blind, that he is that promised Saviour. And in this we have a Reason of the Omissions of the History of the *New Testament*; which were no other than such, as became prudent, as well as faithful Writers.

Much

Much less did that Conciseness (with which the *Unmasker* would cover his bold Censure of the Gospels and the Acts, and as it seems, lay them by with *Contempt*) make the holy Writers omit any Thing, in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, absolutely necessary to be known and believed to make Men Christians.

Conformable hereunto we shall find St. *Luke* writes his History of the *Acts* of the Apostles. In the Beginning of it he sets down at large some of the Discourses made to the unbelieving *Jews*. But in most other Places, unless it be where there was something particular in the Circumstances of the Matter, he contents himself to tell to what Purpose they spoke; which was every where only this, That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*. Nay, St. *Luke*, in the first Speech of St. *Peter*, Acts ii. which he thought fit to give a great Part of, yet owns the Omission of several Things that the Apostle said. For having expressed this fundamental Doctrine, That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, and recorded several of the Arguments wherewith St. *Peter* urged it, for the Conversion of the unbelieving *Jews*, his Auditors, he adds, *ver. 40. And with many other Words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save your selves from this untoward Generation.* Here he confesses, that he had omitted a great deal which St. *Peter* had

Q

had said to persuade them: To what? To that which in other Words he had just said before, *ver. 38. Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ*, i. e. Believe *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, take him as such for your Lord and King, and reform your Lives by a sincere Resolution of Obedience to his Laws.

Thus we have an Account of the Omissions in the Records of *Matters of Fact* in the *New Testament*. But will the *Unmasker* say, That the Preaching of those Articles that he has given us as necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, was Part of *those Matters of Fact*, which have been omitted in the History of the *New Testament*? Can any one think, that *the Corruption and Degeneracy of human Nature, with the true Original of it (the Defection of our first Parents) the Propagation of Sin and Mortality, our Restoration and Reconciliation by Christ's Blood, the Eminency and Excellency of his Priesthood, the Efficacy of his Death, the full Satisfaction thereby made to divine Justice, and his being made an all-sufficient Sacrifice for Sin, our Justification by Christ's Righteousness, Election, Adoption, &c.* were all proposed, and that too in the Sense of our Author's System, by our Saviour and his Apostles, as fundamental Articles of Faith, necessary to be explicitly believ'd by every Man

Man to make him a Christian, in all their Discourses to Unbelievers; and yet that the inspired Penmen of those Histories every where left the Mention of these fundamental Articles wholly out? This would have been to have writ not a *concise*, but an imperfect History of *all* that *Jesus* and his Apostles taught.

What an Account would it have been of the Gospel, as it was first preach'd and propagated, if the greatest Part of the necessary Doctrines of it were wholly left out, and a Man could not find, from one End to the other of this whole History, that Religion which is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian? And yet this is that, which, under the Notion of their being *concise*, the *Unmasker* would persuade us to have been done by St. *Luke*, and the other Evangelists in their Histories. And it is no less than what he plainly says in his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 109. where, to aggravate my Fault in passing by the Epistles, and to shew the Necessity of searching in them for Fundamentals, he in Words blames me; but, in effect, condemns the sacred History contain'd in the Gospels and the Acts. *It is most evident*, says he, *to any thinking Man*, that the Author of the Reasonableness of Christianity *purposely omits the Epistolary Writings of the Apostles,*

Q 2

because

228 *A Second Vindication of the*
because they are fraught with other funda-
mental Doctrines besides that one which he
mentions. There we are instructed concern-
ing these grand Heads of Christian Divi-
nity. Here, i. e. in the Epistles, says he,
there are Discoveries concerning Satisfa-
ction, &c. And in the Close of his List of
grand Heads, as he calls them, some
whereof I have above set down out of him,
he adds, These are the Matters of Faith
contain'd in the Epistles. By all which Ex-
pressions he plainly signifies, that these
which he calls fundamental Doctrines, are
none of those we are instructed in, in the
Gospels and the Acts; that they are not
discover'd nor contain'd in the historical
Writings of the Evangelists: Whereby he
confesses, that either our Saviour and his
Apostles did not propose them in their
Preachings to their unbelieving Hearers;
or else, that the several faithful Writers
of their History, wilfully, i. e. unfaith-
fully, every where omitted them in the
Account they have left us of those Preach-
ings; which would scarce possibly be
done by them all, and every where, with-
out an actual Combination amongst them,
to smother the greatest and most material
Parts of our Saviour's and his Apostles
Discourses. For what else did they, if
all that the Unmasker has set down in his
List be fundamental Doctrines; every one
of

of them absolutely necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, which our Saviour and his Apostles every where preach'd to make Men Christians; but yet St. *Luke*, and the other *Evangelists*, by a very guilty and unpardonable *Conciseness*, every where omitted them, and throughout their whole History never once tell us, they were so much as propos'd, much less that they were those Articles which the Apostles labour'd to establish and convince Men of every where, before they admitted them to Baptism? Nay, the far greatest Part of them, the History they writ does not any where so much as once mention? How, after such an Imputation as this, the *Unmasker* will clear himself from laying by the four Gospels and the *Acts with Contempt*, let him look; if my not collecting Fundamentals out of the Epistles had that Guilt in it. For I never deny'd all the fundamental Doctrines to be there, but only said, that there they were not easy to be found out, and distinguish'd from Doctrines not Fundamental. Whereas our good *Unmasker* charges the historical Books of the *New Testament* with a total Omission of the far greatest Part of those fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, which he says are absolutely necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

To convince the Reader what was absolutely requir'd to be believed to make a Man a Christian, and thereby clear the Holy Writers from the *Unmasker's* Slander, any one need but look a little farther into the History of the *Acts*, and observe St. *Luke's* Method in the Writing of it. In the Beginning (as we observ'd before) and in some few other Places, he sets down at large the Discourses made by the Preachers of Christianity to their unbelieving Auditors. But in the Process of his History, he generally contents himself to relate, what it was their Discourses drive at; what was the Doctrine they endeavour'd to convince their unbelieving Hearers of, to make them Believers. This we may observe is never omitted. This is every where set down. Thus *Acts* v. 42. he tells us, that *daily in the Temple, and in every House, the Apostles ceased not to teach, and to preach JESUS THE MESSIAH.* The Particulars of their Discourses he omits; and the Arguments they used to induce Men to believe, he omits: But never fails to inform us carefully what it was the Apostles *taught and preach'd*, and would have Men believe. The Account he gives us of St. *Paul's* preaching at *Thessalonica*, is this: That *three Sabbath Days* he REASON'D with the *Jews* out of the Scriptures, OPENING and ALLEDGING,

LEDGING, that the *Messiah* must needs have *suffer'd*, and *risen again from the Dead*; and that *Jesus was the Messiah*; Acts xvii. 2, 3. At Corinth, that he **REASON'D** in the Synagogue every Sabbath, and **PERSUADED** the *Jews* and the *Greeks*, and **TESTIFIED** that *Jesus was the Messiah*; Ch. xviii. 4, 5. That *Apollos mightily convinced the Jews*, **SHEWING BY THE SCRIPTURES**, that *Jesus was the Messiah*; Ch. xviii. 27.

By these, and the like Places, we may be satisfy'd what it was that the Apostles *Taught* and *Preach'd*, even in this one Proposition, That *Jesus was the Messiah*: For this was the sole Proposition they *reason'd* about; this alone they *testify'd*, and they *shew'd out of the Scriptures*; and of this alone they endeavour'd to *convince the Jews* and the *Greeks*, that believ'd one God. So that it is plain from hence, that *St. Luke* omitted nothing that the Apostles *Taught* and *Preach'd*; none of those Doctrines, that it was necessary to *convince Unbelievers* of, to make them Christians: Though he in most Places omitted, as was fit, the Passages of Scripture which they alledg'd, and the Arguments those inspired Preachers used to *persuade Men* to believe and embrace that Doctrine.

Another convincing Argument, to shew that *St. Luke* omitted none of those fun-

damental Doctrines, which the Apostles any where propos'd as necessary to be believ'd, is from that different Account he gives us of their Preaching in other Places, and to Auditors otherwise dispos'd. Where the Apostles had to do with idolatrous Heathens, who were not yet come to the Knowledge of the only true God, there he tells us, they propos'd also the Article of the one invisible God, Ma-Maker of Heaven and Earth: And this we find recorded in him out of their Preaching to the *Lystrians*, Acts xiv. and to the *Athenians*, Acts xvii. In the latter of which St. *Luke*, to convince his Reader that he, out of *Conciseness*, omits none of those fundamental Articles that were any where propos'd by the Preachers of the Gospel, as necessary to be believ'd to make Men Christians, sets down not only the Article of *Jesus the Messiah*, but that also of the one invisible God, Creator of all Things; which (if any necessary one might, this) of all other fundamental Articles might, by an Author that affected Brevity, with the fairest Excuse, have been omitted, as being implied in that other of the *Messiah ordained* by God. Indeed, in the Story of what *Paul* and *Barnabas* said at *Lystra*, the Article of the *Messiah* is not mention'd. Not that St. *Luke* omitted that fundamental Article, where
the

the Apostles taught it: But they having here begun their Preaching with that of the one living God, they had not, as appears, Time to proceed farther, and propose to them what yet remain'd to make them Christians: All that they could do, at that Time, was to hinder the People from sacrificing to them. And before we hear any more of their Preaching, they were, by the Instigation of the *Jews*, fallen upon, and *Paul* stoned.

This, by the Way, shews the *Unmasker's* Mistake in his first Particular, *p. 74.* where he says (as he does here again in the second Particular, which we are now examining) that *believing Jesus to be the Messiah, is the first Step to Christianity; and therefore this, rather than any other, was propounded to be believ'd by all those, whom either our Saviour, or the Apostles, invited to embrace Christianity.* The contrary whereof appears here; where the Article of one God is propos'd, in the first Place, to those whose Unbelief made such a Proposal necessary. And therefore if his Reason (which he uses again here, *p. 76.*) were good, *viz.* That the Article of the *Messiah*, is expressly mention'd alone, *because it is a leading Article and makes Way for the rest*; this Reason would rather conclude for the Article of *one God*; and that alone should be expressly mention'd instead of the other.

other : Since, as he argues for the other, *p. 74. If they did not believe this in the first Place, viz. That there was one God, there could be no hopes that they would attend unto any other Proposal relating to the Christian Religion. The Vanity and Falshood of which Reasoning, viz. That the Article of Jesus the Messiah was every where propounded rather than any other, because it was the leading Article, we see in the History of St. Paul's preaching to the Athenians. St. Luke mentions more than one Article, where more than one was propos'd by St. Paul; though the first of them was that leading Article of one God, which if not receiv'd in the first Place, there could be no Hope they would attend to the rest.*

Something the *Unmasker* would make of this Argument of a *leading Article*, for want of a better, though he knows not what. In his first *Particular*, *p. 74.* he makes Use of it to shew, why there was but that one Article propos'd by the first Preachers of the Gospel; and how well that succeeds with him, we have seen. For this is Demonstration, that if there were but that one propos'd by our Saviour and the Apostles, there was but that one necessary to be believ'd to make Men Christians; unless he will impiously say, that our Saviour and the Apostles went about preach-

preaching to no Purpose : For if they propos'd not all that was necessary to make Men Christians, 'twas in vain for them to preach, and others to hear ; if when they heard and believ'd all that was propos'd to them, they were not yet Christians : For if any Article was omitted in the Proposal, which was necessary to make a Man a Christian, though they believ'd all that was propos'd to them, they could not yet be Christians ; unless a Man can from an Infidel become a Christian, without doing what is necessary to make him a Christian.

Farther, if his Argument, of its being a *leading Article*, proves that that alone was propos'd, it is a Contradiction to give it as a Reason, why it was *set down alone* by the Historian, where it was not propos'd alone by the Preacher, but other necessary *Matters of Faith* were propos'd with it ; unless it can be true, that this Article, of *Jesus is the Messiah*, was propos'd alone, by our Saviour and his Apostles, because it was a *leading Article*, and was mentioned alone in the History of what they preach'd because it was a *leading Article*, though it were not propos'd alone, but jointly with other necessary *Matters of Faith*. For this is the Use he makes here again, *p. 76.* of his *leading Article* under his second *Particular*, viz. To shew why
the

the Historians mentioned this necessary Article, of *Jesus the Messiah*, alone, in Places where the Preachers of the Gospel propos'd it not alone, but with other necessary Articles. But in this latter Case it has no Shew of a Reason at all. It may be granted as reasonable for the Teachers of any Religion not to go any farther, where they see the first Article which they propose is rejected; where the *leading* Truth, on which all the rest depends, is not received. But it can be no Reason at all for an Historian, who writes the History of these first Preachers, to set down only the first and leading Article, and omit all the rest, in Instances where more were not only propos'd, but believed and embraced; and, upon that, the Hearers and Believers admitted into the Church. 'Tis not for Historians to put any Distinction between leading, or not leading Articles; but if they will give a true and useful Account of the Religion, whose Original they are writing, and of the Converts made to it, they must tell, not one, but all those necessary Articles, upon Assent to which Converts were baptized into that Religion, and admitted into the Church. Whoever says otherwise, accuses them of falsifying the Story, misleading the Readers, and giving a wrong Account of the Religion which they pretend to teach the World,
and

and to preserve and propagate to future Ages. This (if it were so) no Pretence of *Conciseness* could excuse or palliate.

There is yet remaining one Consideration, which were sufficient of it self to convince us, that it was the sole Article of Faith which was preach'd; and that if there had been other Articles necessary to be known and believ'd by Converts, they could not, upon any Pretence of *Conciseness*, be suppos'd to be omitted: And that is, the Commissions of those, who were sent to preach the Gospel. Which since the sacred Historians mention, they cannot be suppos'd to leave out any material and main Heads of those Commissions.

St. *Luke* records it, *Chap. iv. 43.* that our Saviour says of himself, *I must go unto the other Towns, to tell the good News of the Kingdom; for (εἰς ἅπαντα) upon this Errand am I SENT.* This St. *Mark* calls simply *Preaching.* This Preaching, what it contain'd, St. *Matthew* tells us, *Chap. iv. 23.* *And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their Synagogues, and preaching the good News of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of Sicknes, and all manner of Diseases amongst the People.* Here we have his Commission, or End of his being sent, and the Execution of it; both terminating in this, that he declar'd the good News, that the Kingdom of the *Messiah* was come; and
gave

gave them to understand, by the Miracles he did, that he himself was he. Nor does St. *Matthew* seem to affect such *Conciseness*, that he would have left it out, if the Gospel had contained any other fundamental Parts, necessary to be believ'd to make Men Christians. For he here says, *All manner of Sicknes, and all manner of Diseases*; when either of them might have been better left out, than any necessary Article of the Gospel, to make his History *concise*.

We see what our Saviour was *sent* for. In the next Place, let us look into the Commission he gave the Apostles, when he *sent* them to preach the Gospel. We have it in the xth of St. *Matthew*, in these Words: *Go not into the Way of the Gentiles; and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel. And as ye go, PREACH, SAYING, THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS AT HAND. Heal the Sick, cleanse the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils. Freely have ye received, freely give. Provide neither Gold, nor Silver, nor Brass in your Purses; nor Scrip in your Journey; neither two Coats, neither Shoes, nor yet Staves (for the Workman is worthy of his Meat.) And into whatsoever City or Town ye shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence.*

thence. And when ye come into any House, salute it. And if the House be worthy, let your Peace come upon it : But if it be not worthy, let your Peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your Words, when ye depart out of that House or City, shake off the Dust of your Feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the Land of Sodom and Gomorrha, in the Day of Judgment, than for that City. Behold, I send you forth as Sheep in the midst of Wolves : Be ye therefore wise as Serpents, and harmless as Doves. But beware of Men, for they will deliver you up to the Councils, and they will scourge you in their Synagogues. And ye shall be brought before Governors, and Kings, for my sake, for a Testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no Thought how, or what ye shall speak ; for it shall be given you in that same Hour, what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. And the Brother shall deliver up the Brother to Death, and the Father the Child : And the Children shall rise up against the Parents, and cause them to be put to Death. And ye shall be hated of all Men, for my Name's sake : But he that endureth to the End shall be saved. But when they persecute you in this City, flee ye into another : For verily I say unto you, ye shall

shall not have gone over the Cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come. The Disciple is not above his Master, nor the Servant above his Lord. It is enough for the Disciple that he be as his Master, and the Servant as his Lord. If they have called the Master of the House Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his Household? Fear them not therefore: For there is nothing covered, which shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in Darkness, that speak ye in Light: And what ye hear in the Ear, that preach ye upon the House-tops. And fear not them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul: But rather fear him, which is able to destroy both Soul and Body in Hell. Are not two Sparrows sold for a Farthing? And one of them shall not fall on the Ground, without your Father. But the very Hairs of your Head are all numbred. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more Value than many Sparrows. Whosoever therefore shall confess me before Men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in Heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before Men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven. Think not that I am come to send Peace on Earth: I came not to send Peace, but a Sword. For I am come to set a Man at Variance against his Father, and the Daughter against her Mother; and the Daughter-in-law against her

her Mother-in-law. And a Man's Foes shall be they of his own Household. He that loveth Father and Mother more than me, is not worthy of me: And he that loveth Son or Daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his Cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his Life, shall lose it: And he that loseth his Life for my sake, shall find it. He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me. He that receiveth a Prophet in the Name of a Prophet, shall receive a Prophet's Reward; and he that receiveth a righteous Man, shall receive a righteous Man's Reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little Ones a Cup of cold Water only, in the Name of a Disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his Reward. And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an End of commanding his twelve Disciples——

This is the Commission our Saviour gave the Apostles, when he sent them abroad to recover, and save the lost Sheep of the House of Israel. And will any of the Unmasker's intelligent and observing Men say, that the History of the Scripture is so concise, that any Passages, any essential, any material, nay any Parts at all, of the Apostles Commission, are here omitted by the sacred Penman? This Commission is set down so at

R

full,

242 *A Second Vindication of the*
full, and so particularly, that St. *Matthew*,
who was one of them to whom it was given,
seems not to have left out one Word of
all that our Saviour gave him in Charge.
And it is so large, even to every particular
Article of their Instructions, that I doubt
not but my citing so much *verbatim*, out
of the sacred Text, will here again be
troublesome to the *Unmasker*. But whe-
ther he will venture again to call it *tedious*,
must be as Nature or Caution happen to
have the better on't. Can any one who
reads this Commission, unless he hath the
Brains, as well as the Brow of an *Unmasker*,
alledge that the *Conciseness* of the History
of the Scripture has concealed from us
those fundamental Doctrines, which our
Saviour and his Apostles preach'd; but
the sacred Historians thought fit, by Con-
sent, for unconceivable Reasons, to leave
out in the Narrative they give us of those
Preachings? This Passage here, wholly
confuteth that: They could preach no-
thing but what they were sent to preach.
And that we see is contained in these few
Words: *Preach, saying, the Kingdom of*
Heaven is at Hand. Heal the Sick, cleanse
the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils:
i. e. Acquaint them that the Kingdom of
the *Messiah* is come; and let them know,
by the Miracles you do in my Name, that
I am that King and Deliverer they expect.

If

If there were any other necessary Articles that were to be believed, for the Saving of the *lost Sheep* they were sent to, can one think that *St. Matthew*, who sets down so minutely every Circumstance of their Commission, would have omitted the most important and material of it? He was an Ear-witness, and one that was sent; and so (without supposing him inspir'd) could not be misled by the short Account he might receive from others, who by their own, or others Forgetfulness, might have dropp'd those other fundamental Articles, that the Apostles were order'd to preach.

The very like Account *St. Luke* gives us of our Saviour's Commission to the *Seventy*, *Chap. x. 1—16.* *After these Things the Lord appointed other Seventy also, and sent them two and two before his Face, into every City and Place, whither he himself would come. Therefore said he unto them, The Harvest truly is great, but the Labourers are few: Pray ye therefore the Lord of the Harvest, that he would send forth Labourers into his Harvest. Go your ways: Behold I send you forth as Lambs among Wolves. Carry neither Purse, nor Scrip, nor Shoes: And salute no Man by the Way. And into whatsoever House ye enter, first say, Peace be to this House. And if the Son of Peace be there, your Peace shall rest upon it; if not, it shall return to*

you again. And in the same House remain, eating and drinking such Things as they give: For the Labourer is worthy of his Hire. Go not from House to House. And into whatsoever City ye enter, and they receive you, eat such Things as are set before you. And heal the Sick that are therein, and SAY UNTO THEM, THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS COME NIGH UNTO YOU. But in whatsoever City ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the Streets of the same, and say, Even the very Dust of your City, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: Notwithstanding, be ye sure of this, that the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that Day for Sodom, than for that City. Wo unto thee Chorazin, Wo unto thee Bethsaida: For if the mighty Works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in Sackcloth and Ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, at the Day of Judgment, than for you. And thou Capernaum, which art exalted to Heaven, shalt be thrust down to Hell. He that beareth you, beareth me: And he that despiseth you, despiseth me: And he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

Our Saviour's Commission here to the Seventy, whom he sent to preach, is so
exactly

exactly conformable to that which he had before given to the Twelve Apostles, that there needs but this one Thing more to be observed, to convince any one that they were sent to convert their Hearers to this sole Belief, That the Kingdom of the *Messiah* was come, and that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*; and that the Historians of the *New Testament* are not so *concise* in their Account of this Matter, that they would have omitted any other necessary Articles of Belief that had been given to the Seventy in Commission: That which I mean is, the *Kingdom of the Messiah* is twice mentioned in it to be come, *verse* 9. and 11. If there were other Articles given them by our Saviour to propose to their Hearers, *St. Luke* must be very fond of this one Article, when for *Conciseness* sake, leaving out the other fundamental Articles that our Saviour gave them in Charge to preach, he repeats this more than once.

The *Unmasker's* third Particular, *p.* 76. begins thus: *This also must be thought of, that though there are several Parts and Members of the Christian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one Place of Scripture.* Something is in it (whether owing to his Will, or Understanding, I shall not enquire) that the *Unmasker* always delivers himself in doubtful and ambiguous Terms. It had been as easy for him to have said,

There are several Articles of the Christian Faith necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, as to say (as he does here) *There are several Parts and Members of the Christian Faith.* But, as an Evidence of the Clearness of his Notions, or the Fairness of his Arguing, he always rests in Generals. *There are, I grant, several Parts and Members of the Christian Faith,* which do no more occur in any one Place of Scripture, than the whole *New Testament* can be said to occur in any one Place of Scripture. For every Proposition, delivered in the New Testament for divine Revelation, is a *Part and Member of the Christian Faith.* But 'tis not those *Parts and Members of the Christian Faith* we are speaking of; but only such *Parts and Members of the Christian Faith* as are absolutely necessary to be believ'd by every Man, before he can be a Christian. And in that Sense I deny his Assertion to be true, viz. That they do not occur in any one Place of Scripture: For they do all occur in that first Sermon of St. Peter, Acts ii. 11. by which three Thousand were at that Time brought into the Church; and that in these Words: *Therefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom you have crucified, Lord and Christ. Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ.* Here
is

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 247
is the Doctrine of Jesus the *Messiah*, the
Lord; and of *Repentance*, propos'd to those
who already believe one God: Which, I
say, are all the Parts of the Christian Faith
necessary to be receiv'd to make a Man
a Christian. To suppose, as the *Unmasker*
does here, that more is required, is to beg,
not prove the Question.

If he disputes this Collection of mine
out of that Sermon of *St. Peter*, I will
give him a more authentick Collection of
the necessary Parts of the Christian Faith,
from an Author that he will not question.
Let him look into *Acts* xx. 23, &c. and
there he will find *St. Paul* saying thus to
the Elders of *Ephesus*, whom he was ta-
king his last Leave of, with an Assurance
that he should never see them again:
I have kept back nothing that was profitable
unto you; but have shew'd you, and have
taught you publicly, and from House to
House; testifying both to the Jews, and also
to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and
Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. If
St. Paul knew what was necessary to make
a Christian, here it is: Here he (if he
knew how to do it; for 'tis plain, from
his Words, he design'd to do it) has put it
together. But there is a greater yet than
St. Paul, who has brought all the Parts of
Faith necessary to Salvation into one Place;
I mean our Saviour himself, in these Words:

248 *A Second Vindication of the
This is Life eternal, that they might know
thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ,
whom thou hast sent, John xvii. 13.*

But the Unmasker goes on: *Therefore
when in some Places only one single Part of
the Christian Faith is made mention of, as
necessarily to be embrac'd in order to Salva-
tion, we must be careful not to take it alone,
but to supply it from several other Places,
which make mention of other necessary and
indispensable Points of Belief. I will give
the Reader a plain Instance of this, Rom. x. 9.
If thou shalt believe in thy Heart, that God
hath raised him (i. e. the Lord Jesus) from
the Dead, thou shalt be saved. Here one
Article of Faith, viz. the Belief of Christ's
Resurrection (because it is of so great Im-
portance in Christianity) is only mentioned:
But all the rest must be suppos'd, because
they are mention'd in other Places.*

Ans^w. One would wonder that any one
conversant in Holy Writ, with ever so
little Attention, much more that an Ex-
pounder of the Scriptures, should so mi-
stake the Sense and Stile of the Scripture.
Believing Jesus to be the *Messiah*, with a
lively Faith, i. e. as I have shew'd, taking
him to be our King, with a sincere Sub-
mission to the Laws of his Kingdom, is all
that is required to make a Man a Christian;
for this includes Repentance too. The
believing him therefore to be the *Messiah*,
is

is very often, and with great Reason, put both for Faith and Repentance too; which are sometimes set down singly, where one is put for both, as implying the other; and sometimes they are both mentioned: And then Faith, as contra-distinguish'd to Repentance, is taken for a simple Assent of the Mind to this Truth, That *Jesus* is the *Messiah*. Now this Faith is variously express'd in Scripture.

There are some Particulars in the History of our Saviour, allow'd to be so peculiarly appropriated to the *Messiah*, such incommunicable Marks of him, that to believe them of *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, was in effect the same as to believe him to be the *Messiah*, and so are put to express it. The principal of these, is his Resurrection from the Dead: Which being the great and demonstrative Proof of his being the *Messiah*, 'tis not at all strange that the believing his Resurrection should be put for believing him to be the *Messiah*; since the declaring his Resurrection, was a declaring him to be the *Messiah*. For thus St. Paul argues, *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. *We declare unto you good Tidings, or, we preach the Gospel to you [for so the Word signifies] how that the Promise that was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again.* The Force of which Argument
lies

lies in this, That if *Jesus* was raised from the Dead, then he was certainly the *Messiah*: And thus the Promise of the *Messiah* was fulfilled, in raising *Jesus* from the Dead. The like Argument *St. Paul* useth, *1 Cor. xv. 17. If Christ be not raised, your Faith is vain, you are yet in your Sins: i. e. If Jesus be not risen from the Dead, he is not the Messiah; your believing it is in vain, and you will receive no Benefit by that Faith.* And so likewise from the same Argument of his Resurrection, he at *Thessalonica* proves him to be the *Messiah*, *Acts xvii. 2, 3. And Paul, as his Manner was, went into the Synagogue, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with the Jews out of the Scriptures; opening and alledging that the Messiah must needs have suffered, and risen again from the Dead: And that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is the Messiah.*

The necessary Connection of these two, that if he rose from the Dead, he was the *Messiah*; and if he rose not from the Dead, he was not the *Messiah*; the chief Priests and *Pharisees*, that had prosecuted him to death, understood very well: Who therefore came together unto *Pilate*, saying, *Sir, we remember that that Deceiver said, whilst he was yet alive, After three Days I will rise again. Command therefore that the Sepulchre be made sure unto the third Day, lest his Disciples come by Night and steal him*

him away, and say unto the People, He is risen from the Dead: So the last Error shall be worse than the first. The Error they here speak of, 'tis plain was the Opinion that he was the *Messiah*. To stop that Belief, which his Miracles had procured him amongst the People, they had got him put to death: But if, after that, it should be believed that he rose again from the Dead, this Demonstration that he was the *Messiah*, would but establish what they had labour'd to destroy by his Death; since no one, who believ'd his Resurrection, could doubt of his being the *Messiah*.

'Tis not at all therefore to be wonder'd, that his Resurrection, his Ascension, his Rule and Dominion, and his coming to judge the Quick and the Dead, which are Characteristical Marks of the *Messiah*, and belong peculiarly to him, should sometimes in Scripture be put alone, as sufficient Descriptions of the *Messiah*; and the believing them of him, put for believing him to be the *Messiah*. Thus, *Acts* x. our Saviour in *Peter's* Discourse to *Cornelius*, when he brought him the Gospel, is describ'd to be the *Messiah*, by his Miracles, Death, Resurrection, Dominion, and coming to judge the Quick and the Dead.

These

These (which in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I have upon this Ground taken the Liberty to call *concomitant Articles*) where they are set alone for the Faith to which Salvation is promised, plainly signify the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, that fundamental Article which has the Promise of Life; and so give no Foundation at all for what the *Unmasker* says, in these Words: *Here one Article of Faith, viz. the Belief of Christ's Resurrection (because it is of so great Importance in Christianity) is only mention'd; but all the rest must be suppos'd, because they are mention'd in other Places.*

Answw. If all the rest be of absolute and indispensable Necessity to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, *all the rest* are, every one of them, of equal *Importance*. For Things of equal Necessity to any End, are of equal Importance to that End. But here the Truth forc'd its Way, unawares, from the *Unmasker*. Our Saviour's Resurrection, for the Reason I have given, is truly *of great Importance in Christianity*; so great, that his being or not being the *Messiah*, stands or falls with it: So that these two *important Articles* are inseparable, and in effect make but one. For, since that Time, believe one, and you believe both; deny one of them, and you can believe neither. If the *Unmasker* can
shew

shew me any *one* of the Articles in his List, which is not of this *great Importance*, mentioned alone with a Promise of Salvation for believing it, I will grant him to have some colour for what he says here. But where is to be found, in the Scripture, any such Expression as this: If thou shalt believe, with thy Heart, *the Corruption and Degeneracy of human Nature*, thou shalt be saved? or the like. This Place therefore, out of the *Romans*, makes not for, but against his List of necessary Articles. One of them alone he cannot shew me any where set down, with a *Supposition* of the rest, as having Salvation promis'd to it: Though it be true that that one, which alone is absolutely necessary to be super-added to the Belief of one God, is in divers Places differently express'd.

That which he subjoins, as a Consequence of what he had said, is a farther Proof of this: *And consequently*, says he, *if we would give an impartial Account of our Belief, we must consult those Places: And they are not all together, but dispersed here and there. Wherefore we must look them out, and acquaint our selves with the several Particulars which make up our Belief, and render it entire and consummate.*

Ans. Never was Man constanter to a loose Way of talking. The Question is only about Articles necessary to be believ'd

to make a Man a Christian: And here he talks of the *several Particulars which make up our Belief, and render it intire and consummate*; confounding, as he did before, *Essential and Integral Parts*, which it seems he cannot distinguish. Our Faith is true and saving, when it is such as God, by the New Covenant, requires it to be: But it is not *intire and consummate*, till we explicitly believe all the Truths contained in the Word of God. For the whole Revelation of Truth in the Scripture being the proper and intire Object of Faith, our Faith cannot be *intire and consummate*, till it be adequate to its proper Object, which is the whole divine Revelation contained in the Scripture: And so to make our Faith *intire and consummate*, we must not look out those Places, which he says are not all together. To talk of looking out, and culling of Places, is Nonsense, where the whole Scripture alone can *make up our Belief, and render it intire and consummate*: Which no one, I think, can hope for in this frail State of Ignorance and Error. To make the *Unmasker* speak Sense, and to the Purpose here, we must understand him thus: *That if we will give an impartial Account of the Articles that are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, we must consult those Places where they are, for they are not all together, but* *dis-*

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 255
dispersed here and there: Wherefore we must look them out, and acquaint our selves with the several Particulars which make up the fundamental Articles of our Belief, and will render a Catalogue of them intire and consummate. If his Supposition be true, I grant his Method to be reasonable; and, upon that, I join Issue with him. Let him thus give us an impartial Account of our Belief; let him acquaint us with the several Particulars which make up a Christian's Belief, and render it intire and consummate. Till he has done this, let him not talk thus, in the Air of a Method that will not do: Let him not reproach me, as he does, for not taking a Course, by which he himself cannot do, what he reviles me for failing in. But our hasty Author, says he, took another Course; and thereby deceived himself, and unhappily deceived others. If it be so, I desire the Unmasker to take the Course he proposes, and thereby undeceive me and others; and acquaint us with the several Particulars which make up a Christian's Belief, and render it intire and consummate; for I am willing to be undeceiv'd: But till he has done that, and shewn us by the Success of it that his Course is better, he cannot blame us for following that Course we have done.

I come now to the fourth and last Particular, p. 78. which he says, *is the main Answer to the Objection*; and therefore I shall set it down in his own Words intire, as it stands together. *This, says he, must be borne in our Minds, that Christianity was erected by Degrees, according to that Prediction and Promise of our Saviour, that the Spirit should teach them all Things, John xiv. 26. and that he should guide them into all Truth, John xvi. 13. viz. after his Departure and Ascension, when the Holy Ghost was to be sent in a special Manner to enlighten Mens Minds, and to discover to them the great Mysteries of Christianity. This is to be noted by us, as that which gives great Light in the present Case. The Discovery of the Doctrines of the Gospel was gradual. It was by certain Steps that Christianity climbed to its Height. We are not to think then, that all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly publish'd to the World in our Saviour's Time. Not but that all that were necessary for that Time, were publish'd: But some which are necessary for the succeeding one were not then discover'd, or at least not fully. They had ordinarily no Belief, before Christ's Death and Resurrection, of those substantial Articles; i. e. that he should die, and rise again: But we read in the Acts, and in the Epistles, that these were formal Articles*
of

of Faith afterwards, and are since necessary to compleat the Christian Belief. So as to other great Verities, the Gospel increased by degrees, and was not perfect at once. Which furnishes us with a Reason, why most of the choicest and sublimest Truths of Christianity are to be met with in the Epistles of the Apostles; they being such Doctrines, as were not clearly discover'd and open'd in the Gospels and the Acts. Thus far the Unmasker.

I thought hitherto that the Covenant of Grace in Christ Jesus had been but one, immutably the same: But our Unmasker here makes two, or I know not how many. For I cannot tell how to conceive, that the Conditions of any Covenant should be chang'd, and the Covenant remain the same: Every Change of Conditions, in my Apprehension, makes a new and another Covenant. We are not to think, says the Unmasker, That all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly publish'd to the World in our Saviour's Time; not but that all that were necessary for that Time were publish'd: But some which were necessary for the succeeding one were not then discover'd, or at least not fully. *Answ.* The Unmasker, constant to himself, speaks here doubtfully, and cannot tell whether he should say, that the Articles necessary to succeeding Times, were discovered in our
S Saviour's

258 *A Second Vindication of the*
Saviour's Time, or no: And therefore,
that he may provide himself a Retreat in
the Doubt he is in, he says, *They were not*
clearly publish'd; they were not then dis-
cover'd, or at least not fully. But we must
desire him to pull off his Mask; and to
that Purpose,

1. I ask him how he can tell, that all
the necessary Doctrines were *obscurely pub-*
lish'd, or in part discover'd? For an ob-
scure Publishing, a Discovery in part, is
opposed to, and intimated in, *not clearly*
publish'd, not fully discover'd. And if a
clear and full Discovery be all that he de-
nies to them, I ask,

XXXVII. *Which those fundamental Ar-*
ticles are, which were obscurely pub-
lish'd, but not fully discover'd, in our
Saviour's Time?

And next, I shall desire him to tell me,

XXXVIII. *Whether there are any Ar-*
ticles, necessary to be believed to make
a Man a Christian, that were not dis-
cover'd at all in our Saviour's Time;
and which they are?

If he cannot shew these distinctly, it is
plain he talks at random about them; but
has no clear and distinct Conception of
those

those that were publish'd, or not publish'd, clearly or obscurely discover'd, in our Saviour's Time. It was necessary for him to say something, for those his pretended necessary Articles, which are not to be found any where propos'd, in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, to their yet unbelieving Auditors; and therefore he says, *We are not to think all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly publish'd to the World in our Saviour's Time.* But he barely says it, without giving any Reason why *we are not to think so.* It is enough, that it is necessary to his Hypothesis. He says, *We are not to think so;* and we are presently bound not to think so. Else from another Man, that did not usurp an Authority over our Thoughts, it would have requir'd some Reason to make them think that something more was required, to make a Man a Christian after, than in our Saviour's Time. For, as I take it, it is not a very probable, much less a self-evident Proposition, to be receiv'd without Proof, That there was something *necessary for that Time* to make a Man a Christian, and something more that was *necessary* to make a Man a Christian in the *succeeding Time.*

However, since this great Master says *we ought to think so,* let us in Obedience think so, as well as we can; till he vouch-

safes to give us some Reason to think that there was more required to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, in the succeeding Time, than in our Saviour's. This, instead of removing, does but increase the Difficulty: For if more were necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, after our Saviour's Time, than was during his Life; how comes it that no more was propos'd by the Apostles, in their Preaching to Unbelievers for the making them Christians, after our Saviour's Death, than there was before; even this one Article, that he was the *Messiah*? For I desire the *Unmasker* to shew me any of those Articles, mentioned in his List (except the Resurrection and Ascension of our Saviour, which were intervening Matters of Fact, evidencing him to be the *Messiah*) that were propos'd by the Apostles, after our Saviour's Time, to their unbelieving Hearers, to make them Christians. This one Doctrine, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, was that which was propos'd in our Saviour's Time to be believ'd, as necessary to make a Man a Christian. The same Doctrine was likewise what was propos'd afterwards, in the Preaching of the Apostles to Unbelievers, to make them Christians.

I grant this was more *clearly* propos'd after, than in our Saviour's Time: But, in both of them, it was all that was propos'd

pos'd to the Believers of one God, to make them Christians. Let him shew that there were any other, propos'd in, or after our Saviour's Time, to be believ'd, to make Unbelievers Christians. If he means, by *necessary Articles publish'd to the World*, the other Doctrines contained in the Epistles; I grant they are all of them necessary Articles to be believ'd by every Christian, as far as he understands them. But I deny that they were propos'd to those they were writ to, as necessary to make them Christians, for this demonstrative Reason; because they were Christians already. For Example: Many Doctrines proving, and explaining, and giving a farther Light into the Gospel, are published in the Epistles to the *Corinthians*, and *Thessalonians*. These are all of divine Authority, and none of them may be disbelieved by any one who is a Christian: But yet what was propos'd or publish'd, to both the *Corinthians* and *Thessalonians*, to make them Christians, was only this Doctrine, That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*; as may be seen, *Acts* xvii, xviii. This then was the Doctrine necessary to make Men Christians, in our Saviour's Time; and this the only Doctrine necessary to make Unbelievers Christians, after our Saviour's Time. The only Difference was, that it was more clearly propos'd after, than before his As-

cension: The Reason whereof has been sufficiently explain'd. But any other Doctrine but this, propos'd clearly or obscurely, in, or after our Saviour's Time, as necessary to be believed to make Unbelievers Christians, That remains yet to be shewn.

When the *Unmasker* speaks of the Doctrines that were necessary for the *succeeding Time* after our Saviour, he is in Doubt whether we should say they were, or were not *discover'd*, in our Saviour's Time; and how far they were then *discovered*: And therefore he says, *Some of them were not then discover'd; at least, not fully.* We must here excuse the Doubtfulness of his Talking, concerning the Discovery of his other necessary Articles. For how could he say they were discover'd or not discover'd, clearly or obscurely, fully or not fully; when he does not yet know them all, nor can tell us, what those necessary Articles are? If he does know them, let him give us a List of them; and then we shall see easily whether they were at all publish'd, or discover'd in our Saviour's Time. If there are some of them that were not at all discover'd in our Saviour's Time, let him speak it out, and leave shifting: And if some of those that were *not necessary for our Saviour's Time, but for the succeeding one* only, were yet discover'd in our Saviour's

viour's Time, why were they not necessary to be believ'd in that Time? But the Truth is, he knows not what these Doctrines necessary for succeeding Times are, and therefore can say nothing positively about their Discovery. And for those that he has set down, as soon as he shall name any one of them to be of the Number of those *not necessary for our Saviour's Time*, but *necessary for the succeeding one*, it will presently appear, either that it was discover'd in our Saviour's Time (and then it was as necessary for his Time as the succeeding) or else, that it was not discover'd in his Time, nor to several Converts after his Time, before they were made Christians; and therefore it was no more necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian in the succeeding, than it was in our Saviour's Time. However, general Positions and Distinctions, without a Foundation, serve for Shew, and to beguile unwary and inattentive Readers.

2. Having thus minded him, that the Question is about Articles of Faith necessary to be explicitly and distinctly believ'd, to make a Man a Christian; I then, in the next Place, demand of him to tell me,

XXXIX. *Whether or no all the Articles, necessary now to be distinctly and explicitly believ'd to make any Man a*
S 4 *Christian,*

264 *A Second Vindication of the
Christian, were distinctly and expli-
citly publish'd or discover'd, in our Sa-
viour's Time?*

And then I shall desire to know of
him,

XL. *A Reason why they were not?*

Those that he instances in, of *Christ's Death and Resurrection*, will not help him one Jot: For they are not new Doctrines reveal'd, new Mysteries discover'd; but Matters of Fact, which happen'd to our Saviour in their due Time, to compleat in him the Character and Predictions of the *Messiah*, and demonstrate him to be the Deliverer promised. These are recorded of him by the Spirit of God in Holy Writ; but are no more necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, than any other Part of divine Revelation, but as far as they have an immediate Connection with his being the *Messiah*; and cannot be denied, without denying him to be the *Messiah*: And therefore this Article of his Resurrection (which supposes his Death) and such other Propositions as are convertible with his being the *Messiah*, are, as they very well may be, put for his being the *Messiah*; and, as I have shew'd, propos'd to be believ'd in the Place of it.

All

All that is revealed in Scripture, has a consequential Necessity of being believed by all those to whom it is propos'd; because it is of divine Authority, one Part as much as another. And in this Sense all the divine Truths in the inspired Writings are fundamental, and necessary to be believed. But then this will destroy our *Unmasker's* select Number of fundamental Articles; and *the choicest and sublimest Truths of Christianity*, which he tells us *are to be met with in the Epistles*, will not be more necessary to be believed than any, which he may think the commonest or meanest Truths in any of the Epistles, or the Gospels. Whatsoever Part of divine Revelation, whether reveal'd before, or in, or after our Saviour's Time; whether it contain (according to the Distinction of our *Unmasker's* nice Palate) *choice* or common, *sublime* or not sublime Truths, is necessary to be believ'd by every one, to whom it is propos'd, as far as he understands what is propos'd. But God, by *Jesus Christ*, has entred into a Covenant of Grace with Mankind; a Covenant of Faith, instead of that of Works, wherein some Truths are absolutely necessary to be explicitly believ'd by them to make Men Christians; and therefore those Truths are necessary to be known, and consequently necessary to be propos'd to them, to make them Christians.

stians. This is peculiar to them, to make Men Christians. For all Men, as Men, are under a necessary Obligation to believe what God propos'd to them to be believed: But there being certain distinguishing Truths which belong to the Covenant of the Gospel, which if Men know not, they cannot be Christians; and they being, some of them, such as cannot be known without being propos'd; those, and those only, are the necessary Doctrines of Christianity I speak of; without a Knowledge of, and Assent to which, no Man can be a Christian.

To come therefore to a clear Decision of this Controversy, I desire the *Unmasker* to tell me,

XLI. What those Doctrines are, which are absolutely necessary to be propos'd to every Man, to make him a Christian?

XLII. 1. Whether they are all the Truths of divine Revelation, contained in the Bible?

For, I grant this Argument (which in another Place he uses for some of them, and truly belongs to them all) *viz.* That they were revealed and written there on purpose to be believed; and that it is indispensably

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 267
dispensably necessary for Christians to believe them.

XLIII. 2. *Or whether it be only that one Article, of Jesus being the Messiah, which the History of our Saviour and his Apostles Preaching has, with such a peculiar Distinction, every where propos'd?*

XLIV. 3. *Or whether the Doctrines, necessary to be propos'd to every one to make him a Christian, be any Set of Truths between these two?*

And if he says this latter, then I must ask him,

XLV. *What they are? that we may see why those, rather than any other contain'd in the New Testament, are necessary to be propos'd to every Man to make him a Christian; and if they are not every one propos'd to him, and assented to by him, he cannot be a Christian.*

The *Unmasker* makes a great Noise, and hopes to give his unwary, though well-meaning Readers, odd Thoughts, and strong Impressions against my Book, by declaiming against my *lank Faith*, and my
nar-

narrowing of Christianity to one Article; which, as he says, is the next Way to reduce it to *none*. But when it is consider'd, it will be found that 'tis he that narrows Christianity. The *Unmasker*, as if he were Arbiter and Dispenser of the Oracles of God, takes upon him to single out some Texts of Scripture; and, where the Words of Scripture will not serve his Turn, to impose on us his Interpretations and Deductions, as necessary Articles of Faith; which is, in effect, to make them of equal Authority with the unquestionable Word of God. And thus, partly in the Words of Scripture, and partly in Words of his own, he makes a Set of Fundamentals, *with an Exclusion* of all the other Truths deliver'd by the Spirit of God in the Bible; though all the rest be of the same divine Authority and Original, and ought therefore all equally, as far as they are understood by every Christian, to be believ'd. I tell him, and I desire him to take notice of it, God has no where given him an Authority thus to garble the inspir'd Writings of the Holy Scriptures. Every Part of it is his Word, and ought every Part of it to be believ'd by every Christian Man, according as God shall enable him to understand it. It ought not to be narrow'd to the Cut of the *Unmasker's* peculiar System; 'tis a Presumption of the highest Nature,
for

for him thus to pretend, according to his own Fancy, to establish a Set of fundamental Articles. This is to diminish the Authority of the Word of God, to set up his own; and create a Reverence to his System, from which the several Parts of divine Revelations are to receive their Weight, Dignity, and Authority. Those Passages of Holy Writ which suit with that, are *Fundamental, Choice, Sublime, and Necessary*: The rest of the Scripture (as of no great Moment) is not Fundamental, is not necessary to be believed; may be neglected, or must be tortur'd, to comply with an Analogy of Faith of his own making. But though he pretends to a certain Set of Fundamentals, yet to shew the Vanity and Impudence of that Pretence, he cannot tell us which they are; and therefore in vain contends for a Creed he knows not, and yet is no where. He neither does, and which is more, I tell him he never can give us a Collection of his Fundamentals, gather'd upon his Principles, out of the Scripture, with the Rejection of all the rest, as not Fundamental. He does not observe the Difference there is between what is necessary to be believed by every Man to make him a Christian, and what is required to be believed by every Christian. The first of these is what, by the Covenant of the Gospel, is necessary

to be known, and consequently to be propos'd to every Man, to make him a Christian: The latter is no less than the whole Revelation of God; all the divine Truths contain'd in Holy Scripture; which every Christian Man is under a Necessity to believe, so far as it shall please God, upon his serious and constant Endeavours, to enlighten his Mind to understand them.

The Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, has sufficiently taught us what is necessary to be propos'd to every Man, to make him a Christian. He that believes him to be the promised *Messiah*, takes *Jesus* for his King, and repenting of his former Sins, sincerely resolves to live for the future in Obedience to his Laws, is a Subject of this Kingdom, is a Christian. If he be not, I desire the *Unmasker* to tell me what more is requisite, to make him so. Till he does that, I rest satisfied, that this is all that was at first, and is still necessary, to make a Man a Christian.

This, though it be contained in a few Words, and those not hard to be understood; though it be in one voluntary Act of the Mind, relinquishing all irregular Courses, and submitting it self to the Rule of him, whom God had sent to be our King, and promis'd to be our Saviour; yet it having Relation to the Race of Mankind, from the first Man *Adam*, to the End of

the World; it being a Contrivance, wherein God has display'd so much of his Wisdom and Goodness to the corrupt and lost Sons of Men, and it being a Design to which the Almighty had a peculiar Regard in the whole Constitution and Oeconomy of the *Jews*, as well as in the Prophecies and History of the Old Testament: This was a Foundation capable of large Superstructures. 1. In explaining the Occasion, Necessity, Use, and End of his Coming. 2. Next, in proving him to be the Person promis'd, by a Correspondence of his Birth, Life, Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection, to all those Prophecies and Types of him, which had given the Expectation of such a Deliverer; and to those Descriptions of him, whereby he might be known, when he did come. 3. In the Discovery of the Sort, Constitution, Extent, and Management of his Kingdom. 4. In shewing from what we are delivered by him, and how that Deliverance is wrought out, and what are the Consequences of it.

These, and a great many more the like, afford great Numbers of Truths, delivered both in the Historical, Epistolary, and Prophetical Writings of the New Testament, wherein the Mysteries of the Gospel hidden from former Ages were discover'd; and that more fully, I grant, after the Pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles.

Apostles. But could no body take Christ for the promis'd King, and resolve to obey him, unless he understood all the Truths that concerned his Kingdom, or, as I may say, Mysteries of State of it? The Truth of the contrary is manifest out of the plain and uniform Preaching of the Apostles, after they had received the Holy Ghost, that was to guide them in all Truth. Nay, after the Writing of those Epistles, wherein were contain'd the *Unmasker's sublimest* Truths, they every where propos'd to Unbelievers *Jesus the Messiah* to be their King, *ordain'd* of God; and to this join'd Repentance: And this alone they preach'd, for the Conversion of their unbelieving Hearers. As soon as any one assented to this, he was pronounced a Believer; and these inspired Rulers of the Church, these infallible Preachers of the Gospel, admitted him into Christ's Kingdom by Baptism: And this after, long *after our Saviour's Ascension*, when (as our *Unmasker* expresses it) *the Holy Ghost was to be sent in a special Manner to enlighten Mens Minds, and to discover to them the great Mysteries of Christianity*; even as long as the Apostles liv'd: And what others were to do, who afterwards were to preach the Gospel, St. Paul tells us, *1 Cor. iii. 11. Other Foundation can no Man lay than that is laid, even Jesus the Messiah.* Though upon this Founda-
tion

tion Men might build variously, Things that would, or would not hold the Touch; yet however, as long as they kept firm to this Foundation, they should be saved; as appears in the following Verses.

And indeed, if all the Doctrines of the Gospel, which are contained in the Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, were necessary to be understood, and explicitly believed, in the true Sense of those that delivered them, to make a Man a Christian; I doubt whether ever any one, even to this Day, was a true Christian: Though I believe the *Unmasker* will not deny but that, ere this, Christianity (as he expresses it) *is by certain Steps climb'd to its Height.*

But, for this, the *Unmasker* has found a convenient and wise Remedy. 'Tis but for him to have the Power to declare which of the Doctrines, delivered in Holy Writ, are, and which are not necessary to be believed, with an additional Power to add others of his own, that he cannot find there, and the Business is done. For unless this be allowed him, his System cannot stand: Unless his Interpretations be receiv'd for authentick Revelation, we cannot have all Doctrines necessary for our Time; in Truth, we cannot be Christians. For to this only, what he says concerning the *gradual Discovery of the Doctrines of the Gospel*, tends. *We are not to think,*
T says

says he, *that all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly publish'd to the World in our Saviour's Time: Not but that all that were necessary for that Time were publish'd; but some that were necessary for the succeeding one were not then discover'd, or at least not fully.*

I must here ask the *Unmasker* a short Question or two; as, First,

XLVI. *Are all the Doctrines necessary for our Time contained in his System?*

Next,

XLVII. *Can all the Doctrines necessary for our Time be propos'd in the express Words of the Scripture?*

When he has answer'd these two plain Questions (and an Answer to them I shall expect) the World will then see what he designs, by *Doctrines necessary for our Saviour's Time, and Doctrines necessary for succeeding Times*; whether he means any thing else by it, but the setting up his new System, as the exact Standard of the Gospel, and the true and unalterable Measure of Christianity, in which *it has climb'd to its Height.*

Let

Let not good and sincere Christians be deceiv'd nor perplex'd, by this Maker of another Christianity, than what the infallible Spirit of God has left us in the Scriptures. 'Tis evident, from thence, that whoever takes *Jesus the Messiah* for his King, with a Resolution to live by his Laws, and does sincerely repent as often as he transgresses any of them, is his Subject; all such are Christians. What they are to know, or believe more, concerning him and his Kingdom, when they are his Subjects, he has left upon Record in the great and sacred Code, and Constitutions of his Kingdom; I mean, in the Holy Scriptures. All that is contained therein, as coming from the God of Truth, they are to receive as Truth, embrace as such. But since it is impossible explicitly to believe any Proposition of the Christian Doctrine but what we understand, or in any other Sense than we understand it to have been deliver'd in; an explicit Belief is, or can be requir'd in no Man, of more than what he understands of that Doctrine. And thus, whatsoever upon fair Endeavours he understands to be contained in that Doctrine, is necessary to him to be believed: Nor can he continue a Subject of Christ upon other Terms.

What he is persuaded is the Meaning of Christ his King, in any Expression he finds

in the sacred Code, that, by his Allegiance, he is bound to submit his Mind to receive for true; or else he denies the Authority of Christ, and refuses to believe him: nor can he be excus'd, by calling any one on Earth Master. And hence it is evidently impossible for a Christian to understand any Text in one Sense, and believe it in another, by whomsoever dictated.

All that is contained in the inspired Writings is all of divine Authority, must all be allow'd for such, and receiv'd for divine and infallible Truth, by every Subject of Christ's Kingdom, *i. e.* every Christian. How come then the *Unmasker* to distinguish these Dictates of the Holy Spirit into necessary, and not necessary Truths? I desire him to produce his Commission, whereby he hath the Power given him to tell which of the divine Truths contained in the Holy Scripture are of Necessity to be believed, and which not. Who made him a Judge, or Divider between them? Who gave him this Power over the Oracles of God, to set up one, and debase another at his Pleasure? Some, as he thinks fit, are the *choicest* Truths: And what, I beseech him, are the other? Who made him a Chuser, where no body can pick and chuse? Every Proposition there, as far as any Christian can understand it, is indispensably necessary to be believ'd: And farther

farther than he does understand it, it is impossible for him to believe it. The Laws of Christ's Kingdom do not require Impossibilities, for they are all reasonable, just, and good.

Some of the Truths deliver'd in Holy Writ are very plain: 'Tis impossible, I think, to mistake their Meaning: And those certainly are all necessary to be explicitly believ'd. Others have more Difficulty in them, and are not easy to be understood. Is the *Unmasker* appointed Christ's Vicegerent here, or the Holy Ghost's Interpreter, with Authority to pronounce which of these are necessary to be believ'd, and in what Sense, and which not? The Obscurity that is to be found in several Passages of the Scripture, the Difficulties that cover and perplex the Meaning of several Texts, demand of every Christian Study, Diligence and Attention, in reading and hearing the Scriptures; in comparing and examining them; and receiving what Light he can, from all manner of Helps, to understand these Books, wherein are contain'd the Words of Life. This the *Unmasker*, and every one, is to do for himself; and thereby find out what is necessary for him to believe. But I do not know that the *Unmasker* is to understand and interpret for me, more than I for him. If he has such a Power, I desire

him to produce it. Till then, I can acknowledge no other infallible, but that Guide, which he directs me to himself here, in these Words: *According to our Saviour's Promise, the Holy Ghost was to be sent in a special Manner to enlighten Mens Minds, and to discover to them the great Mysteries of Christianity.* For whether by *Men* he here means those on whom the Holy Ghost was so eminently pour'd out, *Acts* ii. or whether he means by these Words that special Assistance of the Holy Ghost, whereby particular Men, to the End of the World, are to be led into the Truth, by opening their Understandings, that they may understand the Scriptures (for he always loves to speak doubtfully and indefinitely) I know no other infallible Guide, but the Spirit of God in the Scriptures. Nor has God left it in my Choice, to take any Man for such. If he had, I should think the *Unmasker* the unlikelyest to be he, and the last Man in the World to be chosen for that Guide: And herein I appeal to any sober Christian, who hath read what the *Unmasker* has with so little Truth and Decency (for 'tis not always Mens Fault, if they have not Sense) writ upon this Question, whether he would not be of the same Mind?

But yet, as very an *Unmasker* as he is, he will be extremely apt to call you Names,
nay,

may, to declare you no Christian, and boldly affirm you have no Christianity, if you will not swallow it just as it is, of his Cooking. You must take it just as he has been pleas'd to dose it; no more, nor no less, than what is in his System. He hath put himself into the Throne of Christ, and pretends to tell you which are, and which are not the indispensable Laws of his Kingdom: which Parts of his divine Revelation you must necessarily know, understand, and believe, and in what Sense; and which you need not trouble your Head about, but may pass by, as not necessary to be believed. He will tell you that some of his necessary Articles are Mysteries, and yet (as he does, *p. 115. of his Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*) that they are easy to be understood by any Man, when explained to him. In answer to that, I demanded of him, "Who was to explain them? The *Papists*, I told him, would explain some of them one Way, and the *Reform'd* another; the *Remonstrants* and *Anti-Remonstrants* give them different Senses; and probably the *Trinitarians* and *Unitarians* will profess, that they understand not each other's *Explications*." But to this, in his Reply, he has not vouchsafed to give me any Answer: Which yet I expect, and I will tell him why; because as there are different Ex-

T 4

plainers,

plainers, there will be different Fundamentals. And therefore, unless he can shew his Authority to be the sole Explainer of Fundamentals, he will in vain make such a Pother about his Fundamentals. Another Explainer, of as good Authority as he, will set up others against them. And what then shall we be the better, for all this Stir and Noise of Fundamentals? All the Effect of it will be just the same it has been these thousand Years, and upwards; Schisms, Separations, Contentions, Animosities, Quarrels, Blood, and Butchery, and all that Train of Mischiefs which has so long harra's'd and defam'd Christianity, and are so contrary to the Doctrine, Spirit, and End of the Gospel: And which must still continue, as long as any such *Unmasker* shall take upon him to be the Dispenser and Dictator to others of Fundamentals; and peremptorily to define which Parts of divine Revelation are necessary to be believed, and which Christians may with Safety dispense with, and not believe.

To conclude: What was sufficient to make a Man a Christian in our Saviour's Time, is sufficient still, *viz.* the taking him for our King and Lord, ordained so by God. What was necessary to be believed by all Christians in our Saviour's Time, as an indispensable Duty, which
they

they ow'd to their Lord and Master, was the believing all divine Revelation, as far as every one could understand it: And just so it is still, neither more nor less. This being so, the *Unmasker* may make what Use he pleases of his Notion, *That Christianity was erected by Degrees*: It will no way (in that Sense in which it is true) turn to the Advantage of his select Fundamental, necessary Doctrines.

The next Chapter has nothing in it but his great Bug-bear, whereby he hopes to fright People from reading my Book, by crying out, *Socinianism, Socinianism!* Whereas I challenge him again, to shew one Word of *Socinianism* in it. But, however, it is worth while to write a Book, to prove me a *Socinian*. Truly, I did not think my self so considerable, that the World need be troubled about me, whether I were a Follower of *Socinus*, *Arminius*, *Calvin*, or any other Leader of a Sect among Christians. A Christian I am sure I am; because I believe *Jesus to be the Messiah*, the King and Saviour promis'd, and sent by God: And, as a Subject of his Kingdom, I take the Rule of my Faith and Life from his Will, declar'd and left upon Record in the inspir'd Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, in the *New Testament*; which I endeavour, to the utmost of my Power, as is my Duty, to understand

stand in their true Sense and Meaning. To lead me into their true Meaning, I know (as I have above declar'd) no infallible Guide but the same Holy Spirit, from whom these Writings at first came. If the *Unmasker* knows any other infallible Interpreter of Scripture, I desire him to direct me to him: Till then, I shall think it according to my Master's Rule, not to be call'd, nor to call any Man on Earth *Master*. No Man, I think, has a Right to prescribe to me my Faith, or magisterially to impose his Interpretations or Opinions on me: Nor is it material to any one what mine are, any farther than they carry their own Evidence with them. If this, which I think makes me of no Sect, entitles me to the Name of a *Papist*, or a *Socinian*, because the *Unmasker* thinks these the worst, and most invidious he can give me; and labours to fix them on me for no other Reason, but because I will not take him for my *Master on Earth*, and his System for my Gospel; I shall leave him to recommend himself to the World by this Skill, who no doubt will have Reason to thank him for the Rareness and Subtilty of his Discovery. For, I think, I am the first Man that ever was found out to be at the same Time a *Socinian*, and a Factor for *Rome*. But what is too hard for such an *Unmasker*? I must be what he thinks fit;

fit; when he pleases, a *Papist*; and when he pleases, a *Socinian*; and when he pleases, a *Mahometan*; and probably, when he has consider'd a little better, an *Atheist*; for I hardly scap'd it, when he writ last. My Book, he says, had a Tendency to it; and if he can but go on, as he has done hitherto, from Surmises to Certainties, by that Time he writes next his Discovery will be advanc'd, and he will certainly find me an *Atheist*. Only one Thing I dare assure him of, that he shall never find that I treat the Things of God, or Religion so, as if I made only a Trade, or a Jest of them. But let us now see how, at present, he proves me a *Socinian*.

His first Argument is, my not answering for my leaving out *Matth. xxviii. 19.* and *John i. 1. p. 82.* of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*. This he takes to be a Confession that I am a *Socinian*. I hope he means fairly; and that if it be so on my Side, it must be taken for a standing Rule between us, that where any Thing is not answer'd, it must be taken for granted. And upon that Score I must desire him to remember some Passages of my *Vindication*, which I have already, and others which I shall mind him of hereafter, which he pass'd over in Silence, and had nothing to say to; which therefore, by his own Rule, I shall desire the Reader to observe, that he has granted.

This

This being premised, I must tell the *Unmasker*, that I perceive he reads my Book with the same Understanding that he writes his own. If he had done otherwise, he might have seen that I had given him a Reason for my Omission of those two, and other *plain and obvious Passages, and famous Testimonies in the Evangelists*, as he calls them; where I say, *p. 269.* “ That
 “ if I have left out none of those *Passages*
 “ or *Testimonies*, which contain what our
 “ Saviour and his Apostles preach’d, and
 “ requir’d Assent to, to make Men Be-
 “ lievers, I shall think my Omissions (let
 “ them be what they will) no Faults in
 “ the present Case. Whatever Doctrines
 “ Mr. *Edwards* would have to be believ’d,
 “ to make a Man a Christian, he will be
 “ sure to find them in those Preachings,
 “ and *famous Testimonies* of our Saviour
 “ and his Apostles, I have quoted. And
 “ if they are not there, he may rest satis-
 “ fied that they were not propos’d by our
 “ Saviour and his Apostles, as necessary to
 “ be believed, to make Men Christ’s Dis-
 “ ciples.” From which Words any one, but an *Unmasker*, would have understood my Answer to be, That all that was necessary to be believed to make Men Christians, might be found in what our Saviour and his Apostles propos’d to Unbelievers for their Conversion: But the two Passages
 above-

above-mention'd, as well as a great many others in the Evangelists, being none of those, I had no Reason to take Notice of them. But the *Unmasker* having, out of his good Pleasure, put it once upon me, as he does in his *Thoughts of the Causes of Atheism*, p. 107. that I was an *Epitomizer of the Evangelical Writings*, though every one may see I make not that my Business; yet 'tis no matter for that, I must be always accountable to that Fancy of his. But when he has prov'd,

XLVII. *That this is not as just a Reason for my omitting them, as several other obvious Passages, and famous Testimonies in the Evangelists, which I here mention, for whose Omission he does not blame me;*

I will undertake to give him another Reason; which I know not whether he were not better let alone.

The next Proof of my being a *Socinian*, is, that I take the *Son of God* to be an Expression us'd to signify the *Messiah*. *Slichtingius* and *Socinus* understood it so; and therefore I am, the *Unmasker* says, a *Socinian*. Just as good an Argument, as that I believe *Jesus* to be a Prophet; and so do the *Mahometans*; therefore I am a *Mahometan*: Or thus, the *Unmasker* holds that

2

the

the Apostles Creed does not contain all Things necessary to Salvation ; and so says *Knot* the Jesuit ; therefore the *Unmasker* is a Papist. Let me turn the Tables, and by the same Argument I am Orthodox again. For two Orthodox, Pious, and very Eminent Prelates of our Church, whom, when I follow Authorities, I shall prefer to *Slichtingius* and *Socinus*, understand it as I do ; and therefore I am Orthodox. Nay, it so falls out, that if it were of Force either Way, the Argument would weigh most on this side ; since I am not wholly a Stranger to the Writings of these two Orthodox Bishops ; but I never read a Page, in either of those *Socinians*. The never sufficiently admir'd and valu'd Archbishop *Tillotson's* Words, which I quoted, the *Unmasker* says, *do not necessarily import any such thing*. I know no Words, that *necessarily import* any thing to a Caviller. But he was known to have such clear Thoughts, and so clear a Stile ; so far from having any thing doubtful or fallacious in what he said, that I shall only set down his Words, as they are in his Sermon of *Sincerity*, p. 2. to shew his Meaning : *Nathaniel*, says he, *being satisfied that he [our Saviour] was the Messiah, he presently own'd him for such ; calling him THE SON OF GOD, and the King of Israel.*

The Words of the other Eminent Pre-
late, the Bishop of Ely, whom our Church
is still happy in, are these: *To be the Son
of God, and to be Christ, being but different
Expressions of the same Thing*; witness, p. 14.
And p. 10. *It is the very same Thing to be-
lieve that Jesus is the Christ, and to believe
that Jesus is the Son of God, express it how
you please. This ALONE is the Faith
which can regenerate a Man, and put a di-
vine Spirit into him, that it makes him a
Conqueror over the World, as Jesus was.*
Of this the Unmasker says, that this Reve-
rend Author speaking only in a general Way,
represents these two as the same Thing, viz.
That Jesus is the Christ, and that Jesus is
the Son of God; because these Expressions
are applied to the same Person, and be-
cause they are both comprehended in one
general Name, viz. Jesus. *Answ.* The
Question is, whether these two Expres-
sions, *the Son of God*, and *the Messiah*, in
the learned Bishop's Opinion, signify the
same Thing? If his Opinion had been
ask'd in the Point, I know not how he
could have declar'd it more clearly. For
he says they are *Expressions of the same
Thing*, and that *it is the very same Thing
to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, and to
believe that he is the Son of God*; which
cannot be so, if *Messiah* and *Son of God*
have different Significations: For then
I they

Simon
Petrus

they will make two distinct Propositions in different Senses; which it can be no more the same Thing to believe, than it is the same Thing to believe that Mr. *Edwards* is a notable Preacher, and a notable Railer; or than it is to believe one Truth, and all Truths. For by the same Reason, that it is the *same Thing to believe* two distinct Truths, it will be the *same Thing to believe* two thousand distinct Truths, and consequently all Truths. The *Unmasker*, that he might seem to say something, says that the *Reverend Author represents these as the same Thing*. *Answ.* The *Unmasker* never fails, like *Midas*, to turn every Thing he touches into his own Metal. The learned Bishop says, very directly and plainly, that *to be the Son of God*, and *to be the Messiah*, are *Expressions of the same Thing*: And the *Unmasker* says, he *represents these Expressions as one Thing*: For 'tis of Expressions, that both the Bishop and he speak. Now *Expressions* can be *one Thing*, but one of these two Ways: Either in Sound, and so these two Expressions are not one; or in Signification, and so they are. And then the *Unmasker* says, but in other Words, what the Bishop had said before, *viz.* That these two, *to be the Son of God*, and *to be the Messiah*, are *Expressions of the same Thing*. Only the *Unmasker* has put in the Word *represents* to amuse his

his Reader, as if he had said something; and so indeed he does, after his Fashion, *i. e.* obscurely and fallaciously; which when it comes to be examin'd, is but the same Thing under shew of a Difference: Or else, if it has a different Meaning, is demonstratively false. But so it be obscure enough to deceive a willing Reader, who will not be at the Pains to examine what he says, it serves his Turn.

But yet, as if he had said something of Weight, he gives Reasons for putting *represents these two Expressions as one Thing*, instead of saying, these two are but *different Expressions of the same Thing*.

The first of his Reasons is, Because the Reverend Author is here *speaking only in a General Way*. *Ans.* What does the *Unmasker* mean by a *General Way*? The learned Bishop speaks of two particular *Expressions*, applied to our Saviour. But was his Discourse ever so general, how could that alter the plain Signification of his Words, *viz.* That those two are but *different Expressions of the same Thing*?

Secondly, *Because these Expressions are applied to the same Person*. *Ans.* A very demonstrative Reason, is it not, that therefore they cannot be different *Expressions of the same Thing*?

U

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *And because they are both comprehended in one general Name, viz. Jesus.* *Answ.* It requires some Skill, to put so many Falshoods in so few Words; for neither both, nor either of these Expressions, are *comprehended* in the Name *Jesus*: And that *Jesus*, the Name of a particular Person, should be a *general Name*, is a Discovery reserv'd to be found out by this new Logician. However, *General* is a learned Word; which when a Man of Learning has us'd twice, as a Reason of the same Thing, he is cover'd with *Generals*. He need not trouble himself any farther about Sense; he may safely talk what Stuff he pleases, without the least Suspicion of his Reader.

Having thus strongly prov'd just nothing, he proceeds and tells us, *p. 91. Yet it does not follow thence, but that if we will speak strictly and closely, we must be forc'd to confess they are of different Significations.* By which Words (if his Words have any Signification) he plainly allows that the Bishop meant as he says, that these two are but *different Expressions of the same Thing*: But withal tells him, that if he will *speake closely and strictly*, he must say, *they are of different Significations.* My Concernment in the Case being only, that, in the Passages alledg'd, the Reverend Author said that
the

the *Son of God*, and the *Messiah*, were *different Expressions of the same Thing*, I have no more to demand after these Words of the *Unmasker*; he has in them granted all I would have: And I shall not meddle with his *speaking closely and strictly*, but shall leave it to the decisive Authority of this superlative Critick to determine, whether this learned Bishop, or any one living, besides himself, can understand the Phrases of the *New Testament*, and *speak strictly and closely* concerning them. Perhaps his being yet alive, may preserve this eminent Prelate from the malicious Drivling of this *Unmasker's* Pen, which has bespatter'd the Ashes of two of the same Order, who were no mean Ornaments of the *English Church*; and if they had been now alive, no body will doubt but the *Unmasker* would have treated them after another Fashion.

But let me ask the *Unmasker*, whether, if either of these pious Prelates, whose Words I have above quoted, did understand that Phrase of the *Son of God* to stand for the *Messiah*; (which they might do, without holding any one *Socinian* Tenet) he will dare to pronounce him a *Socinian*. This is so ridiculous an Inference, that I could not but laugh at it: But withal tell him, *Vindic.* p. 279. "That if the Sense
" wherein I understand those Texts be a
" Mistake, I shall be beholden to him to

“ set me right: But they are not popular
 “ Authorities, or frightful Names, where-
 “ by I judge of Truth or Falshood.” To
 which I subjoin these Words: “ You will
 “ now, no doubt, applaud your Con-
 “ jectures, the Point is gain’d, and I am
 “ openly a *Socinian*; since I will not dis-
 “ own, that I think the *Son of God* was a
 “ Phrase, that, among the *Jews* in our
 “ Saviour’s Time, was us’d for the *Mes-*
 “ *siah*, though the *Socinians* understand it
 “ in the same Sense: And therefore I must
 “ certainly be of their Persuasion in every
 “ Thing else. I admire the Acuteness,
 “ Force, and Fairness of your Reasoning;
 “ and so I leave you to triumph in your
 “ Conjectures.” Nor has he fail’d my Ex-
 pectation: For here, p. 91. of his *Soci-*
nianism Unmask’d, he, upon this, erects
 his Comb, and crows most mightily.
We may, says he, from hence, as well as
other Reasons, pronounce him the same with
those Gentlemen (i. e. as he is pleas’d to
 call them, *my good Patrons and Friends,*
the Racovians) *which you may perceive he*
is very apprehensive of, and thinks that this
 will be reckon’d a good Evidence of his being
 what he denied himself to be before. The
 Point is gain’d, saith he, and I am openly
 a *Socinian*. He never utter’d truer Words
 in his Life, and they are the Confutation
 of all his Pretences to the contrary. This
 Truth,

*Truth, which unwarily dropp'd from his Pen,
confirms what I have laid to his Charge.*
Now you have sung your Song of Triumph, 'tis fit you should gain your Victory, by shewing,

XLIX. *How my understanding the Son of God to be a Phrase us'd amongst the Jews in our Saviour's Time, to signify the Messiah, proves me to be a Socinian.*

Or if you think you have prov'd it already, I desire you to put your Proof into a Syllogism: For I confess my self so dull, as not to see any such Conclusion deducible from my understanding that Phrase as I do, even when you have prov'd that I am mistaken in it.

The Places, which in the *New Testament* shew that the *Son of God* stands for the *Messiah*, are so many, and so clear, that I imagine no body that ever consider'd and compar'd them together, could doubt of their Meaning, unless he were an *Unmasker*. Several of them I have collected and set down, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 26, 38, 39, 45, 49, 55, 84, 89, 90, 91.

First, *John the Baptist*, John i. 20. when the *Jews* sent to know who he was, confess'd he himself was not the *Messiah*.

But of *Jesus* he says, *ver. 34.* after having several Ways, in the foregoing Verses, declar'd him to be the *Messiah*; *And I saw and bare Record, that this is the SON OF GOD.* And again, *Chap. iii. 26—36.* he declaring *Jesus* to be, and himself not to be the *Messiah*, he does it in these synonymous Terms, of the *Messiah* and *the Son of God*; as appears by comparing *ver. 28, 35, 36.*

Nathaniel owns him to be the *Messiah*, in these Words, *John i. 50. Thou art the SON OF GOD, Thou art the King of Israel:* Which our Saviour, in the next Verse, calls *Believing*; a Term, all thro' the History of our Saviour, used for owning *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*. And for confirming that Faith of his, that he was the *Messiah*, our Saviour farther adds, that he should see *greater Things*; i. e. should see him do greater Miracles, to evidence that he was the *Messiah*.

Luke iv. 41. And Devils also came out of many, crying, Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God; and he rebuking them, suffered them not to speak. And so again, *St. Mark* tells us, *Chap. iii. 11, 12. That unclean Spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he strictly charged them, that they should not make him known.* In both these Places, which relate to different Times,
and

and different Occasions, the Devils declare *Jesus* to be *the Son of God*. 'Tis certain, whatever they meant by it, they used a Phrase of a known Signification in that Country: And what may we reasonably think they designed to make known to the People by it? Can we imagine these unclean Spirits were Promoters of the Gospel, and had a Mind to acknowledge and publish to the People the Deity of our Saviour, which the *Unmasker* would have to be the Signification of *the Son of God*? Who can entertain such a Thought? No, they were no Friends to our Saviour; and therefore desired to spread a Belief of him, that he was the *Messiah*, that so he might, by the Envy of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, be disturb'd in his Ministry, and be cut off before he had compleated it. And therefore we see our Saviour, in both Places, forbids them to make him known; as he did his Disciples themselves, for the same Reason. For when *St. Peter*, Matt. xvi. 16. had own'd *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, in these Words, *Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God*; it follows, ver. 20. *Then charged he his Disciples that they should tell no Man, that he was Jesus the Messiah*: Just as he had forbid the Devils to make him known, *i. e.* to be the *Messiah*. Besides, these Words here of *St. Peter* can be taken in no other Sense, but barely to sig-

nify that *Jefus* was the *Meffiah*, to make them a proper Answer to our Saviour's Question. His first Question here, to his Disciples, *ver. 13.* is, *Whom do Men say that I the Son of Man am?* The Question is not, Of what Original do you think the *Meffiah*, when he comes, will be? for then this Question would have been as it is *Matt. xxii. 42.* *What think ye of the Meffiah, whose Son is he?* if he had enquired about the common Opinion, concerning the Nature and Descent of the *Meffiah*: But his Question is concerning himself; *Whom*, of all the extraordinary Persons known to the *Jews*, or mentioned in their sacred Writings, the People thought him to be? That this was the Meaning of his Question, is evident from the Answer the Apostles gave to it; and his farther Demand, *ver. 14, 15.* *They said, Some say thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the Prophets. He saith unto them, But WHOM say ye that I am?* The People take me, some for one of the Prophets, or extraordinary Messengers from God, and some for another: But which of them do you take me to be? *Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Meffiah, the Son of the living God.* In all which Discourse, 'tis evident there was not the least Enquiry made by our Saviour concerning the Person, Nature,

or

or Qualifications of the *Messiah*; but whether the People or his Apostles thought him, *i. e.* *Jesus of Nazareth*, to be the *Messiah*. To which St. *Peter* gave him a direct and plain Answer, in the foregoing Words; declaring their Belief of him to be the *Messiah*: Which is all that, with any manner of Congruity, could be made the Sense of St. *Peter's* Answer. This alone, of it self, were enough to justify my Interpretation of St. *Peter's* Words, without the Authority of St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*, both whose Words confirm it. For St. *Mark*, Chap. viii. 29. renders it, *Thou art the Messiah*; and St. *Luke*, Chap. ix. 18. *The Messiah of God*. To the like Question, *Who art thou?* *John the Baptist* gives a like Answer, *John* i. 19, 20. *I am not the Christ*. By which Answer, as well as by the following Verses, it is plain nothing was understood to be meant by that Question, but which of the extraordinary Persons promised to, or expected by the *Jews*, art thou?

John xi. 27. The Phrase of the *Son of God* is made use of by St. *Martha*; and that it was us'd by her to signify the *Messiah*, and nothing else, is evident out of the Context. *Martha* tells our Saviour, that if he had been there before her Brother died, he, by that divine Power which he had manifested in so many Miracles which he had done, could
have

have saved his Life: And that now, if our Saviour would ask it of God, he might obtain the Restoration of his Life. *Jesus* tells her, he shall rise again: Which Words *Martha* taking to mean at the general Resurrection, at the last Day; *Jesus* thereupon takes occasion to intimate to her that he was the *Messiah*, by telling her that he was *the Resurrection and the Life*: i. e. That the Life, which Mankind should receive at the general Resurrection, was by and through him. This was a Description of the *Messiah*: It being a receiv'd Opinion amongst the *Jews*, that when the *Messiah* came, the Just should rise, and live with him for ever. And having made this Declaration of himself to be the *Messiah*, he asks *Martha*, Believest thou this? What? Not whose Son the *Messiah* should be; but whether he himself was the *Messiah*, by whom Believers should have eternal Life, at the last Day? And to this she gives this direct and apposite Answer; *Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the World.* The Question was only whether she was persuaded that those, who believe in him, should be raised to eternal Life? That was, in effect, whether he was the *Messiah*? And to this she answers, *Yea, Lord, I believe this of thee*: And then she explains what was contain'd in that Faith of hers;
even

even this, That he was the *Messiah* that was promis'd to come, by whom alone Men were to receive eternal Life.

What the *Jews* also understood by the *Son of God*, is also clear from that Passage at the latter End of *Luke* xxii. They having taken our Saviour, and being very desirous to get a Confession from his own Mouth, that he was the *Messiah*, that they might from thence be able to raise a formal and prevalent Accusation against him before *Pilate*; the only Thing the Council ask'd him, was, whether he was the *Messiah*? ver. 67. To which he answers so in the following Words, that he lets them see he understood that the Design of their Question was to entrap him, and not to believe in him, whatever he should declare of himself. But yet he tells them, *Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the Right Hand of the Power of God*: Words, that to the *Jews* plainly enough own'd him to be the *Messiah*; but yet such as could not have any Force against him with *Pilate*. He having confels'd so much, they hope to draw yet a clearer Confession from him. *Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What need we any farther Witness? For we our selves have heard, of his own Mouth. Can any one think that the Doctrine of his Deity (which*

is

is that which the *Unmasker* accuses me for waving) was that which the *Jews* design'd to accuse our Saviour of before *Pilate*, or that they needed Witnesses for? Common Sense, as well as the Current of the whole History, shews the contrary. No; it was to accuse him, that he own'd himself to be the *Messiah*, and thereby claim'd a Title to be King of the *Jews*. The Son of God was so known a Name amongst the *Jews* to stand for the *Messiah*, that having got that from his Mouth, they thought they had Proof enough of Treason against him. This carries with it a clear and easy Meaning. But if the *Son of God* be to be taken, as the *Unmasker* would have it, for a Declaration of his Deity, I desire him to make common and coherent Sense of it.

I shall add one Consideration more, to shew that the *Son of God* was a Form of Speech then used amongst the *Jews* to signify the *Messiah*, from the Persons that us'd it, viz. *John the Baptist*, *Nathaniel*, *St. Peter*, *St. Martha*, the *Sanhedrim*, and the *Centurion*, Luke xxvii. 54. Here are *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Friends*, *Enemies*, *Men*, *Women*, *Believers*, and *Unbelievers*; all indifferently use this Phrase of the *Son of God*, and apply it to *Jesus*. The Question between the *Unmasker* and me is, whether it was used by these several Persons as an Appellation of the *Messiah*, or (as the *Un-*
masker



masker would have it) in a quite different Sense; as such an Application of Divinity to our Saviour, that he that shall deny that to be Meaning of it in the Minds of these Speakers, denies the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*. For if they did speak it without that Meaning, it is plain it was a Phrase known to have another Meaning; or else they had talk'd unintelligible Jargon. Now I will ask the *Unmasker*, whether he thinks that the eternal *Generation*, or, as the *Unmasker* calls it, *Filiation* of *Jesus* the Son of God, was a Doctrine that had enter'd into the Thoughts of all the Persons above-mentioned; even of the *Roman Centurion*, and the Soldiers that were with him, watching *Jesus*? If he says he does, I suppose he thinks so only for this Time, and for this Occasion: And then it will lie upon him to give the World convincing Reasons for his Opinion, that they may think so too: Or if he does not think so, he must give up this Argument; and allow that this Phrase, in these Places, does not necessarily import the Deity of our Saviour, and the Doctrine of his eternal Generation: And so a Man may take it to be an Expression standing for the *Messiah*, without being a *Socinian*, any more than he himself is one.

There is one Place, the Unmasker tells us, p. 87. that confutes all the Surmises about
the

the Identity of these Terms. It is, says he, that famous Confession of Faith which the Ethiopian Eunuch made, when Philip told him he might be baptized, if he believed. This, without doubt, was said according to that Apprehension which he had of Christ, from Philip's instructing him; for it is said, he preach'd unto him Jesus, ver. 35. He had acquainted him that Jesus was the Christ, the Anointed of God; and also that he was the Son of God, which includes in it that he was God. And accordingly this noble Profelyte gives this Account of his Faith, in order to his being baptized, in order to his being admitted a Member of Christ's Church; I believe that Jesus is the Son of God: Or you may read it according to the Greek, I believe the Son of God to be Jesus Christ. Where there are these two distinct Propositions:

1st, That Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah.

2dly, That he is not only the Messiah, but the Son of God.

The Unmasker is every where steadily the same subtle Arguer. Whether he has prov'd that the *Son of God*, in this Confession of the *Eunuch*, signifies what he would have, we shall examine by and by. This at least is Demonstration, that this Passage of his overturns his Principles; and reduces his long List of Fundamentals to two

Propositions, the Belief whereof is sufficient to make a Man a Christian. *This noble Profelyte*, says the *Unmasker*, gives *this Account of his Faith*, in order to his being baptiz'd, in order to his being admitted a Member of *Christ's Church*. And what is that Faith, according to the *Unmasker*? He tells you *there are in it these two distinct Propositions*; viz. I believe, 1st, *That Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah*: 2^{dly}, *That he is not only the Messiah, but the Son of God*. If this *famous Confession*, containing but these two Articles, were enough to his being baptiz'd; if this Faith were sufficient to make *this noble Profelyte* a Christian; what is become of all those other Articles of the *Unmasker's System*, without the Belief whereof he, in other Places, tells us a Man cannot be a Christian? If he had here told us that *Philip had not Time nor Opportunity*, during his short Stay with the Eunuch, to explain to him all the *Unmasker's System*, and make him understand all his Fundamentals, he had had Reason on his Side; and he might have urg'd it as a Reason why *Philip* taught him no more. But nevertheless he had, by allowing the *Eunuch's Confession of Faith* sufficient for his Admittance *as a Member of Christ's Church*, given up his other Fundamentals, as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; even that of the
Holy

Holy Trinity: And he has at last reduc'd his necessary Articles to these two, viz. That *Jesus is the Messiah*; and that *Jesus is the Son of God*. So that after his ridiculous calling mine a *lank Faith*, I desire him to consider what he will now call his own. Mine is next to *none*, because, as he says, it is but *one* Article. If that Reasoning be good, his is not far from *none*: It consists but in two Articles; which is next to *one*, and very little more remote from *none* than *one* is. If any one had but as much Wit as the *Unmasker*, and could be but as smart upon the Number *Two*, as he has been upon an *Unit*, here were a brave Opportunity for him to lay out his Parts; and he might make vehement Complaints against one, that has thus *scrap'd our Faith, corrupted Mens Minds, depraved the Gospel, and abused Christianity*. But if it should fall out, as I think it will, that the *Unmasker's* two Articles should prove to be but one; he has saved another that Labour, and he stands painted to himself with his own Charcoal.

The *Unmasker* would have the *Son of God*, in the Confession of the Eunuch, to signify something different from the *Messiah*: And his Reason is, because else it would be an *absurd Tautology*. *Ans.* There are many exegetical Expressions put together in Scripture, which though they signi-

signify the same Thing, yet are not *absurd Tautologies*. The *Unmasker* here inverts the Proposition, and would have it to signify thus, *The Son of God is Jesus the Messiah*; which is a Proposition so different from what the Apostles proposed every where else, that he ought to have given a Reason why, when every where else they made the Proposition to be of something affirmed of *Jesus of Nazareth*, the Eunuch should make the Affirmation to be of something concerning the Son of God: As if the Eunuch knew very well what the *Son of God* signified, viz. as the *Unmasker* tells us here, that it included or signified *God*; and that *Philip* (who we read at *Samaria* preach'd τὸν Χριστόν, *the Messiah*, i. e. instructed them who the *Messiah* was) had here taken Pains only to instruct him, that this God was *Jesus the Messiah*, and to bring him to assent to that Proposition. Whether this be natural to conceive, I leave to the Reader.

The *Tautology*, on which the *Unmasker* builds his whole Objection, will be quite remov'd, if we take *Christ* here for a Proper Name: In which Way it is us'd by the Evangelists and Apostles in other Places, and particularly by St. *Luke*; as *Acts* ii 38. iii. 6, 20. iv. 10. xxiv. 24, &c. In two of these Places it cannot, with any good Sense, be taken otherwise; for if it be not,

306 *A Second Vindication of the*
in *Acts* iii. 6. and iv. 10. us'd as a Proper
Name, we must read those Places thus,
Jesus the Messiah of Nazareth. And I
think it is plain, in those others cited, as
well as in several other Places of the *New*
Testament, that the Word *Christ* is used as
a Proper Name. We may easily conceive,
that long before the *Acts* were writ, the
Name of *Christ* was grown, by a familiar
Use, to denote the Person of our Saviour,
as much as *Jesus*. This is so manifest,
that it gave a Name to his Followers; who,
as St. *Luke* tells us, *Chap.* xi. 26. were called
Christians; and that, if Chronologists mi-
stake not, twenty Years before St. *Luke*
writ his History of the Apostles: And this
so generally, that *Agrippa* a Jew uses it,
Acts xxvi. 28. And that *Christ*, as the
Proper Name of our Saviour, was got as
far as *Rome*, before St. *Luke* writ the *Acts*,
appears out of *Suetonius*, l. 5. And by that
Name he is call'd in *Tacitus*, Ann. l. 15.
'Tis no wonder then that St. *Luke*, in wri-
ting this History, should sometimes set it
down alone, sometimes join'd with that
of *Jesus*, as a Proper Name; which is
much easier to conceive he did here, than
that *Philip* propos'd more to the Eunuch
to be believ'd, to make him a Christian,
than what in other Places was propos'd for
the Conversion of others, or than what he
himself propos'd at *Samaria*.

His

His 7th Chapter is to prove that I am a *Socinian*, because I omitted *Christ's Satisfaction*. That Matter having been answered, p. 120. where it came properly under Consideration, I shall only observe here, that the great Stress of his Argument lies as it did before; not upon my total Omission of it out of my Book, but on this, that *I have no such Thing in the Place, where the Advantages of Christ's Coming are purposely treated of*: From whence he will have this to be an unavoidable Inference, viz. *That I was of opinion that Christ came not to satisfy for us*. The Reason of my Omission of it in that Place, I told him, was because my Book was chiefly design'd for *Deists*; and therefore I mentioned only those Advantages, which all Christians must agree in; and, in omitting of that, complied with the Apostle's Rule, *Rom. xiv.* To this he tells me flatly, that was not the *Design* of my Book. Whether the *Unmasker* knows with what Design I publish'd it, better than I my self, must be left to the Reader to judge: For as for his Veracity, in what he knows, or knows not, he has given so many Instances of it, that I may safely refer that to any body. One Instance more of it may be found in this very Chapter, where he says, *I pretend indeed, p. 264, 265. that in another Place of my Book I mention Christ's*

308 *A Second Vindication of the*
restoring all Mankind from the State of
Death, and restoring them to Life; and
his laying down his Life for another, as
our Saviour professes he did. *These few*
Words this Vindicator hath pick'd up in his
Book since he wrote it: This is all, through
his whole Treatise, that he hath dropp'd con-
cerning that Advantage of Christ's Incar-
nation, i. e. Christ's Satisfaction. Answ.
But that this is not *all* that I dropp'd thro'
my whole Treatise concerning that Advan-
tage, may appear by those Places above-
mentioned, p. 128, 129. where I say, that
the Design of *Christ's* Coming was to be
offer'd up; and speak of the Work of *Re-*
demption; which are Expressions taken to
imply our Saviour's Satisfaction. But the
Unmasker thinking I should have quoted
them, if there had been any more besides
those mentioned in my *Vindication*, upon
that Presumption sticks not boldly to af-
firm, that there were no more; and so goes
on, with the Veracity of an *Unmasker*.
If affirming would do it, nothing could be
wanting in his Cause, that might be for his
Purpose. Whether he be as good at pro-
ving, this Consequence (amongst other
Propositions which remain upon him to
be prov'd) will try, *viz.*

L. *That if the Satisfaction of Christ be*
not mentioned in the Place where the
Advan-

Advantages of Christ's Coming are purposely treated of, then I am of opinion that Christ came not to satisfy for us.

Which is all the Argument of the 7th Chapter.

His last Chapter, as his first, begins with a Commendation of himself; particularly, it boasts his Freedom from *Bigotism*, *Dogmatizing*, *Censoriousness*, and *Uncharitableness*. I think he hath drawn himself so well with his own Pen, that I shall need refer the Reader only to what he himself has writ in this Controversy, for his Character.

In the next Paragraph, *p. 104.* he tells me, *I laugh at Orthodoxy.* *Ans.* There is nothing that I think deserves a more serious Esteem than right Opinion (as the Word signifies) if taken up with the Sense and Love of Truth. But this Way of becoming Orthodox has always Modesty accompanying it, and a fair Acknowledgment of Fallibility in our selves, as well as a Supposition of Error in others. On the other side, there is nothing more ridiculous than for any Man, or Company of Men, to assume the Title of Orthodoxy to their own Set of Opinions, as if Infallibility were annexed to their Systems, and those were to be the standing Measure of Truth to all the World; from whence they erect to them-

themselves a Power to censure and condemn others, for differing at all from the Tenets they have pitch'd upon. The Consideration of human Frailty ought to check this Vanity: But since it does not, but that with a sort of Allowance it shews it self in almost all Religious Societies, the playing the Trick round sufficiently turns it into Ridicule. For each Society having an equal Right to a good Opinion of themselves, a Man passing but a River or a Hill loses that Orthodoxy in one Company, which puffed him up with such Assurance and Insolence in another; and is there, with equal Justice, himself expos'd to the like Censures of Error and Heresy, which he was so forward to lay on others at home. When it shall appear that Infallibility is entail'd upon one Set of Men of any Denomination, or Truth confin'd to any Spot of Ground, the Name and Use of Orthodoxy, as now it is in fashion every where, will in that one Place be reasonable. Till then, this ridiculous Cant will be a Foundation too weak to sustain that Usurpation that is rais'd upon it. 'Tis not that I do not think every one should be persuaded of the Truth of those Opinions he professes: 'Tis that I contend for; and 'tis that which I fear the great Sticklers for Orthodoxy often fail in. For we see generally that Numbers of them exactly jump
in

in a whole large Collection of Doctrines, consisting of Abundance of Particulars; as if their Notions were by one common Stamp printed on their Minds, even to the least Lineament. This is very hard, if not impossible, to be conceived of those who take up their Opinions only from Conviction. But how fully soever I am persuaded of the Truth of what I hold, I am in common Justice to allow the same Sincerity to him that differs from me; and so we are upon equal Terms. This Persuasion of Truth on each side, invests neither of us with a Right to censure or condemn the other. I have no more Reason to treat him ill for differing from me, than he has to treat me ill for the same Cause. Pity him, I may; inform him fairly, I ought; but contemn, malign, revile, or any otherwise prejudice him, for not thinking just as I do, that I ought not. My Orthodoxy gives me no more Authority over him, than his (for every one is Orthodox to himself) gives him over me. When the Word Orthodoxy (which in effect signifies no more but the Opinions of any Party) is made use of as a Pretence to domineer (as ordinarily it is) it is, and always will be ridiculous.

He says, *I hate, even with a deadly Hatred, all Catechisms and Confessions, all Systems and Models.* I do not remember that I have once mentioned the Word *Cate-*
X 4 *chism,*

312 *A Second Vindication of the*
chism, either in my *Reasonableness of Chri-*
stianity, or *Vindication*; but he knows I
bate them deadly, and I know I do not.
And as for *Systems* and *Models*, all that I
say of them, in the Pages he quotes to
prove my Hatred of them, is only this,
viz. in my *Vindication*, p. 267. “ Some
“ Men had rather you should write *Booby*,
“ and cross your own Design of removing
“ Mens Prejudices to Christianity, than
“ leave out one Tittle of what they put
“ into their Systems.—Some Men will
“ not bear it, that any one should speak
“ of Religion, but according to the Model
“ that they themselves have made of it.”
In neither of which Places do I speak a-
gainst *Systems* or *Models*, but the ill Use
that some Men make of them.

He tells me also in the same Place, p. 104.
that I *deride Mysteries*. But, for this, he
hath quoted neither Words nor Place:
And where he does not do that, I have
reason, from the frequent Liberties he takes
to impute to me what no where appears in
my Books, to desire the Reader to take
what he says not to be true. For did he
mean fairly, he might, by quoting my
Words, put all such Matters of Fact out
of Doubt; and not force me so often as he
does, to demand where it is? As I do now
here again,

LI. *Where it is that I deride Mysteries?*

His

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 313

His next Words, p. 104. are very remarkable: They are; *O how he [the Vindicator] grins at the Spirit of Creed-making! P. 274, 275. Vind. The very Thoughts of which do so haunt him, so plague and torment him, that he cannot rest till it be conjur'd down. And here, by the way, seeing I have mentioned his Rancour against Systematick Books and Writings, I might represent the Misery that is coming upon all Booksellers, if this Gentleman and his Correspondents go on successfully. Here is an effectual Plot to undermine Stationers-Hall; for all Systems and Bodies of Divinity, Philosophy, &c. must be cashier'd: Whatsoever looks like System, must not be bought or sold. This will fall heavy on the Gentlemen of St. Paul's Church-yard, and other Places. Here the politick Unmasker seems to threaten me with the Possie of Paul's Church-yard, because my Book might lessen their Gain in the Sale of Theological Systems. I remember that Demetrius the Shrine-maker, which brought no small Gain to the Craftsmen whom he called together, with the Workmen of like Occupation, said to this Purpose; Sirs, Ye know that by this Craft we have our Wealth: Moreover, ye see, and hear, that this Paul hath persuaded, and turned away much People, saying, that they be no Gods that are made with Hands; so that this our Craft is in danger to be set at nought. And*
when

when they heard these Sayings, they were full of Wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians! Have you, Sir, who are so good at Speech-making, as a worthy Successor of the Silver-smith, regulating your Zeal for the Truth, and your writing Divinity by the Profit it will bring, made a Speech to this Purpose to the *Craftsmen*, and told them, that I say Articles of Faith, and Creeds, and Systems in Religion, cannot be made by Mens Hands or Fancies; but must be just such, and no other than what God hath given us in the Scriptures? And are they ready to cry out, to your Content, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians?* If you have well warm'd them with your Oratory, 'tis to be hoped they will heartily join with you, and bestir themselves, and chuse you for their Champion, to prevent the *Misery* you tell them *is coming upon them*, in the Loss of the Sale of *Systems and Bodies of Divinity*: For, as for *Philosophy*, which you name too, I think you went a little too far; nothing of that kind, as I remember, hath been so much as mentioned. But however, some sort of Orators, when their Hands are in, omit nothing, true or false, that may move those they would work upon. Is not this a worthy Employment, and becoming a Preacher of the Gospel, to be a Solicitor for *Stationers-Hall*; and make the Gain
of

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 315
of the *Gentlemen of Paul's Church-yard* a
Consideration for or against any Book writ
concerning Religion? This, if it were
ever thought on before, no body but an
Unmasker, who lays all open, was ever so
foolish as to publish. But here you have
an Account of his Zeal: The Views of
Gain are to measure the Truths of Divi-
nity. Had his Zeal, as he pretends in the
next Paragraph, no other Aims but the
Defence of the Gospel, 'tis probable this
Controversy would have been managed
after another Fashion.

Whether what he says in the next, *p. 105.*
to excuse his so often pretending to *know*
my Heart and Thoughts, will satisfy the
Reader, I shall not trouble my self. By
his so often doing it again, in his *Soci-*
nianism Unmask'd, I see he cannot write
without it: And so I leave it to the Judg-
ment of the Readers, whether he can be
allowed to know other Mens 'Thoughts,
who in many Occasions seems not well to
know his own. The Railing in the Re-
mainder of this Chapter I shall pass by, as
I have done a great deal of the same Strain
in his Book: Only, to shew how well he
understands or represents my Sense, I shall
set down my Words, as they are in the
Pages he quotes, and his Inferences from
them.

Vind. p. 278, 279.

I know not but it may be true, that the *Anti-Trinitarians* and *Racovians* understand those Places as I do: But 'tis more than I know, that they do so. I took not my Sense of those Texts from those Writers, but from the Scripture it self; giving Light to its own Meaning, by one Place compar'd with another. What in this Way appears to me its true Meaning, I shall not decline; because I am told that it is so understood by the *Racovians*, whom I

never yet read; nor embrace the contrary, though the Generality of Divines I more converse with, should declare for it. If the Sense wherein I understand those Texts be a Mistake, I shall be beholden to you, if you will set me right. But they are not popular Authorities, or frightful Names, whereby I judge of Truth and Falshood.

He

Socin. Unm. p. 108.

The profess'd Divines of England, you must know, are but a pitiful Sort of Folks with this great Racovian Rabbi. He tells us plainly, that he is not mindful of what the Generality of Divines declare for, p. 279. He labours so concernedly to ingratiate himself with the Mob, the Multitude (which he so often talks of) that he hath no Regard to these: The Generality of the Rabble are more considerable with him, than the Generality of Divines.

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 317

He tells me here of the *Generality of Divines*. If he had said of the Church of *England*, I could have understood him: But he says, *The profess'd Divines of England*; and there being several Sorts of Divines in *England*, who I think do not every where agree in their Interpretations of Scripture, which of them is it I must have Regard to, where they differ? If he cannot tell me that, he complains here of me for a Fault which he himself knows not how to mend.

Vind. p. 275.

The List of Materials for his Creed, (for the Articles are not yet formed) Mr. Edwards closes, pag. III. with these Words: *These are the Matters of Faith contained in the Epi-*

Socin. Unm. p. 109.

This Author, as demure and grave as he would sometimes seem to be, can scoff at the Matters of Faith contained in the Apostles Epistles, p. 275.

stles; and they are Essential and Integral Parts of the Gospel it self. What just these, neither more nor less? If you are sure of it, pray let us have them speedily, for the Reconciling of Differences in the Christian Church, which has been so cruelly torn about the Articles of the Christian Faith, to the great Reproach of Christian Charity, and Scandal of our true Religion.

Does

318 *A Second Vindication of the*

Does the *Vindicator* here *scoff* at the *Matters of Faith contained in the Epistles*? or shew the vain Pretences of the *Unmasker*, who undertakes to give us out of the *Epistles* a Collection of Fundamentals, without being able to say whether those he sets down be all or no?

Vind. p. 287.

Socin. Unm. p. 110.

I hope you do not think, how contemptibly soever you speak of the *Venerable Mob*, as you are pleased to dignify them, p. 117. that the Bulk of Man-

To coaks the Mob, he profanely brings in that Place of Scripture; Have any of the Rulers believed in him?

kind, or in your Phrase the *Rabble*, are not concern'd in Religion, or ought not to understand it, in order to their Salvation. I remember the *Pharisees* treated the common People with Contempt; and said, *Have any of the Rulers or of the Pharisees believed in him? But this People, who knoweth not the Law, are cursed.* But yet these, who in the Censure of the *Pharisees* were cursed, were some of the *Poor*, or, if you please to have it so, the *Mob*, to whom the Gospel was preached by our Saviour; as he telis *John's Disciples*, Matt. xi. 5.

Where

Where the *Profaneness* of this is, I do not see; unless some unknown Sacredness of the *Unmasker's* Person make it *Profaneness* to shew that he, like the *Pharisees* of old, has a great Contempt for the Common People, *i. e.* the far greater Part of Mankind; as if they and their Salvation were below the Regard of this elevated *Rabbi*. But this of *Profaneness* may be well borne from him; since in the next Words, my mentioning another Part of his Carriage, is no less than *Irreligion*.

Vind. p. 281.

He prefers what I say to him my self, to what is offered to him from the Word of God; and makes me this Compliment, that I begin to mend about the Close, *i. e.*

when I leave off quoting of Scripture, and the dull Work was done, of *going through the History of the Evangelists and the Acts*, which he computes, p. 105. to take up three Quarters of my Book.

Socin. Unm. p. 110.

Ridiculously and irreligiously he pretends, that I prefer what he saith to me, to what is offer'd to me from the Word of God, p. 281.

The Matter of Fact is as I relate it, and so is beyond *Pretence*; and for this I refer the Reader to the 105th and 114th Pages of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*.

Atbeism. But had I mistaken, I know not how he could have called it *irreligiously*. Make the worst of it that can be, how comes it to be *irreligious*? What is there divine in an *Unmasker*, that one cannot pretend (true or false) that he prefers what I say, to what is offer'd him from the Word of God, without doing it *irreligiously*? Does the very assuming the Power to define Articles, and determine who are, and who are not Christians, by a Creed not yet made, erect an *Unmasker* presently into God's Throne, and bestow on him the Title of *Dominus Deusque noster*, whereby Offences against him come to be *irreligious Acts*? I have misrepresented his Meaning: Let it be so; where is the *Irreligion* of it? Thus it is: The Power of making a Religion for others (and those that make Creeds do that) being once got into any one's Fancy, must at last make all Oppositions to those Creeds and Creed-makers, *Irreligion*. Thus we see in Process of Time it did in the Church of *Rome*: But it was in Length of Time, and by gentle Degrees. The *Unmasker*, it seems, cannot stay; is in haste, and at one Jump leaps into the Chair. He has given us yet but a Piece of his Creed, and yet that is enough to set him above the State of human Mistakes or Frailties; and to mention any such Thing in him, is to do *irreligiously*.

We may farther see, says the Unmasker, p. 110. how counterfeit the Vindicator's Gravity is, whilst he condemns frothy and light Discourses, p. 281. Vindic. and yet, in many Pages together, most irreverently treats a great Part of the Apostolical Writings, and throws aside the main Articles of Religion as unnecessary. Answ. In my Vindication, p. 276. you may remember these Words; "I require you to publish "to the World those Passages, which "shew my Contempt of the Epistles?" Why do you not (especially having been so called upon to do it) set down those Words, wherein I most irreverently treat a great Part of the Apostolical Writings? At least, why do you not quote those many Pages wherein I do it? This looks a little suspiciously, that you cannot: And the more, because you have, in this very Page, not been sparing to quote Places which you thought to your Purpose. I must take Leave therefore (if it may be done without Irreligion) to assure the Reader that this is another of your many Mistakes in Matters of Fact, for which you have not so much as the Excuse of Inadvertency: For, as he sees, you have been minded of it before. But an Unmasker, say what you will to him, will be an Unmasker still.

He closes what he has to say to me, in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, as if he were in the Pulpit, with an Use of Exhortation. The false Insinuations it is filled with, make the Conclusion of a piece with the *Introduction*. As he sets out, so he ends; and therein shews wherein he places his Strength. A Custom of making bold with Truth, is so seldom curable in a grown Man, and the *Unmasker* shews so little Sense of Shame, where it is charged upon him, beyond a Possibility of clearing himself, that no body is to trouble themselves any farther about that Part of his established Character. Letting therefore that alone to Nature and Custom, two sure Guides, I shall only entreat him, to prevent his taking Railing for Argument, (which I fear he too often does,) that upon his Entrance every where upon any new Argument, he would set it down in Syllogism; and when he has done that (that I may know what is to be answer'd) let him then give vent as he pleases, to his noble Vein of Wit and Oratory.

The lifting a Man's self up in his own Opinion, has had the Credit, in former Ages, to be thought the lowest Degradation that human Nature could well sink it self to. Hence says the Wise Man, *Prov. xxvi. 6. Answer a Fool according to his Folly, lest he be wise in his own Conceit:*
 Hereby

Hereby shewing, that Self-conceitedness is a Degree beneath ordinary Folly. And therefore he there provides a Fence against it, to keep even Fools from sinking yet lower, by falling into it. Whether what was not so in *Solomon's Days*, be now, by length of Time, in ours, grown into a Mark of Wisdom and Parts, and an Evidence of great Performances, I shall not enquire. Mr. *Edwards*, who goes beyond all that ever I yet met with, in the Commendation of his own, best knows why he so extols what he has done in this Controversy. For fear the Praises he has not been sparing of, in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, should not sufficiently trumpet out his Worth, or might be forgotten; he, in a new Piece, entitled *The Socinian Creed*, proclaims again his mighty Deeds, and the Victory he has established to himself by them, in these Words: *But he and his Friends (the One-Article-Men) seem to have made Satisfaction by their profound Silence lately; whereby they acknowledge to the World, that they have nothing to say in Reply to what I laid to their Charge, and fully proved against them, &c. Socinian Creed, p. 128.* This fresh Testimony of no ordinary Conceit, which Mr. *Edwards* hath of the Excellency and Strength of his Reasoning, in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, I leave with him and his Friends to be consider'd

of at their Leisure: And if they think I have mis-applied the Term of Conceitedness to so wise, understanding, and every way accomplished a Disputant (if we may believe him) I will teach them a Way how he, or any body else, may fully convince me of it. There remains, on his Score, mark'd in this Reply of mine, several Propositions to be proved by him. If he can but find Arguments to prove them, that will bear the setting down in Form, and will so publish them, I will allow my self to be mistaken. Nay, which is more, if he, or any body, in the 112 Pages of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, can find but ten Arguments that will bear the Test of Syllogism, the true Touchstone of right Arguing, I will grant that that Treatise deserves all those Commendations he has bestowed upon it; though it be made up more of his own Panegyrick, than a Confutation of me.

In his *Socinian Creed* (for a *Creed-maker* he will be; and whether he has been as lucky for the *Socinians* as for the *Orthodox*, I know not) *p.* 120. he begins with me, and that with the same conquering Hand and Skill which can never fail of Victory, if a Man has but Wit enough to know what Proposition he is able to confute, and then make that his Adversary's Tenet. But the Repetitions of his old Song, concerning

cerning *one Article, the Epistles, &c.* which occur here again, I shall only set down; that none of these excellent Things may be lost, whereby this acute and unanswerable Writer has so well deserved his own Commendations: *viz.* That I say *there is but one single Article of the Christian Truth necessary to be believed and assented to by us,* p. 121. That I *slight the Christian Principles, curtail the Articles of our Faith, and ravish Christianity it self from him,* p. 123. And that I *turn the Epistles of the Apostles into waste Paper,* p. 127, &c.

These, and the like Slanders, I have already given an Answer to, in my Reply to his former Book. Only one new one here I cannot pass over in Silence, because of the remarkable Profaneness which seems to me to be in it; which, I think, deserves publick Notice. In my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I have laid together those Passages of our Saviour's Life, which seemed to me most eminently to shew his Wisdom, in that Conduct of himself, with that Reserve and Caution which was necessary to preserve him, and carry him through the appointed Time of his Ministry. Some have thought I had herein done considerable Service to the Christian Religion, by removing those Objections which some were apt to make from our Saviour's Carriage, not rightly understood. This *Creed-*

326 *A Second Vindication of the*
maker tells me, p. 127. *that I make our*
Saviour a Coward: A Word not to be ap-
plied to the Saviour of the World, by a
pious and discreet Christian, upon any Pre-
tence, without great Necessity and sure
Grounds. If he had set down my Words,
and quoted the Page (which was the least
could have been done to excuse such a Phrase)
we should then have seen which of us two
this impious and irreligious Epithet, given
to the Holy *Jesus*, has for its Author. In
the mean Time I leave it with him, to be
accounted for by his Piety to those, who
by his Example shall be encouraged to en-
ertain so vile a Thought, or use so pro-
fane an Expression of the *Captain of our*
Salvation, who freely gave himself up to
Death for us.

He also says in the same p. 127. *That*
I every where strike at Systems; the Design
of which is to establish one of my own, or to
foster Scepticism, by beating down all others.

For clear Reason or good Sense, I do
not think our *Creed-maker* ever had his
Fellow. In the immediate preceding
Words of the same Sentence, he charges
me with a *great Antipathy against Systems*;
and before he comes to the End of it, finds
out my *Design* to be the *establishing one of*
my own. So that this, *my Antipathy against*
Systems, makes me in love with one. My
Design, he says, *is to establish a System of*
my

my own, or to foster Scepticism, in beating down all others. Let my Book, if he pleases, be my System of Christianity. Now is it in me any more *fostering Scepticism*, to say my System is true, and others not, than it is in the *Creed-maker* to say so of all other Systems but his own? For, I hope, he does not allow any System of Christianity to be true, that differs from his, any more than I do.

But I have spoke against all Systems. *Answe.* And always shall, so far as they are set up by particular Men or Parties, as the just Measure of every Man's Faith; wherein every Thing that is contained, is required and imposed to be believed to make a Man a Christian: Such an Opinion and Use of Systems I will always be against, till the *Creed-maker* shall tell me, amongst the Variety of them, which alone is to be received and rested in, in the Absence of his Creed; which is not yet finished, and I fear will not as long as I live. That every Man should receive from others, or make to himself such a System of Christianity as he found most conformable to the Word of God, according to the best of his Understanding, is what I never spoke against; but think it every one's Duty to labour for, and to take all Opportunities as long as he lives, by studying the Scriptures every Day, to perfect.

But this, I fear, will not go easily down with our Author; for then he cannot be a *Creed-maker* for others: A Thing he shews himself very forward to; how able to perform it, we shall see when his Creed is made. In the mean time, talking loudly and at random about Fundamentals, without knowing what is so, may stand him in some stead.

This being all that is new, which I think my self concerned in, in this *Socinian Creed*, I pass on to his *Postscript*. In the first Page whereof I find these Words: *I found that the Manager of the Reasonableness of Christianity had prevailed with a Gentleman to make a Sermon upon my Refutation of that Treatise, and the Vindication of it.* Such a Piece of Impertinency as this, might have been borne from a fair Adversary: But the Sample Mr. *Edwards* has given of himself, in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, persuades me this ought to be bound up with what he says of me in his Introduction of that Book, in these Words: *Among others, they thought and made choice of a Gentleman, who they knew would be extraordinary useful to them: And he, it is probable, was as forward to be made use of by them, and presently accepted of the Office that was assigned him.* And more there to the same Purpose: All which, I know to be utterly false.

'Tis

'Tis pity that one who relies so intirely upon it, should have no better an Invention. The *Socinians* set the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. on work to write that Book; by which Discovery the World being (as Mr. *Edwards* says) *let into the Project*, that Book is confounded, *baffled*, blown off, and by this skilful Artifice there is an End of it. Mr. *Bold* preaches and publishes a Sermon without this irrefragable Gentleman's good Leave and Liking: What now must be done to discredit it, and keep it from being read? Why, Mr. *Bold* too was set on work, by the *Manager of the Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. In your whole Store-house of Stratagems, you that are so great a Conqueror, have you but this one Way to destroy a Book which you set your Mightiness against, but to tell the World it was a Job of Journey-work for some body you do not like? Some other would have done better in this new Case, had your happy Invention been ready with it: For you are not so bashful or reserv'd, but that you may be allow'd to be as great a Wit as he who profess'd himself ready at any Time to say a good or a new Thing, if he could but think of it. But in good earnest, Sir, if one should ask you, Do you think no Books contain Truths in them, which were undertaken by the *Procuracion* of a
Book-

Bookseller? I desire you to be a little tender in the Point, not knowing how far it may reach. Ay, but such Booksellers live not at the *Lower End of Pater-Noster-Row*, but in *Paul's Church-Yard*; and are the Managers of other-guess Books, than *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. And therefore you very rightly subjoin, *Indeed it was a great Master-piece of Procuration; and we can't but think that Man must speak Truth, and defend it very impartially and substantially, who is thus brought on to undertake the Cause*. And so Mr. Bold's Sermon is found to have neither Truth nor Sense in it, because it was printed by a Bookseller at the lower End of *Pater-Noster-Row*; for that, I dare say, is all you know of the Matter. But that is Hint enough, for a happy Diviner, to be sure of the rest; and with Confidence to report that for certain Matter of Fact, which had never any Being, but in the fore-casting Side of his Politick Brain.

But whatever were the Reasons that moved Mr. B. to preach that Sermon, of which I know nothing; this I am sure, it shews only the Weakness and Malice (I will not say, and ill Breeding, for that concerns not one of Mr. *Edwards's* Pitch) of any one, who excepts against it, to take notice of any Thing more than what the Author has published. Therein alone consists

sists the Error, if there be any; and that alone those meddle with, who write for the sake of Truth. But poor Cavillers have other Purposes, and therefore must use other Shifts, and make a Bustle about something besides the Argument, to prejudice and beguile unwary Readers.

The only Exception the *Creed-maker* makes to Mr. *Bold's* Sermon, is the Contradiction he imputes to him, in saying, "That there is but one Point, or Article, necessary to be believed for the making a Man a Christian: And that there are many Points *besides this*, which Jesus Christ hath taught and revealed, which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand:" And, "That there are particular Points and Articles, which being known to be revealed by Christ, Christians must indispensibly assent to." And where now is there any thing like a Contradiction in this? Let it be granted, for Example, that the *Creed-maker's* Set of Articles (let their Number be what they will, when he has found them all out) are necessary to be believed, for the making a Man a Christian: Is there any Contradiction in it to say, There are many Points, besides these, which Jesus Christ hath taught and revealed, which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand?

derstand ? If this be not so, it is but for any one to be perfect in Mr. *Edwards's* Creed, and then he may lay by the Bible ; and, from thenceforth, he is absolutely dispensed with from studying, or understanding any thing more of the Scripture.

But Mr. *Edwards's* Supremacy is not yet so far established, that he will dare to say that Christians are not obliged to endeavour to understand any other Points revealed in the Scripture, but what are contained in his Creed. He cannot yet well discard all the rest of the Scripture, because he has yet need of it for the completing of his Creed ; which is like to secure the Bible to us for some Time yet : For I will be answerable for it, he will not be quickly able to resolve what Texts of the Scripture do, and what do not contain Points necessary to be believed. So that I am apt to imagine that the *Creed-maker*, upon second Thoughts, will allow that saying there is but One, or there are but Twelve, or there are but as many as he shall set down (when he has resolved which they shall be) necessary to the making a Man a Christian ; and the saying there are other Points besides contained in the Scripture, which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand, and must believe, when he knows them

them to be revealed by Jesus Christ, are two Propositions that may consist together without a Contradiction.

Every Christian is to partake of that Bread and that Cup, which is the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. And is not every sincere Christian indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand these Words of our Saviour's Institution, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*? And if, upon his serious Endeavour to do it, he understands them in a literal Sense, that Christ meant that that was really his Body and Blood, and nothing else; must he not necessarily believe that the Bread and Wine, in the Lord's Supper, is changed really into his Body and Blood, though he doth not know how? Or, if having his Mind set otherwise, he understands the Bread and Wine to be really the Body and Blood of Christ, without ceasing to be true Bread and Wine: Or else, if he understands them that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily, and indeed given and received in the Sacrament in a spiritual Manner: Or lastly, if he understands our Saviour to mean, by those Words, only the Bread and Wine to be a Representation of his Body and Blood: In which Way soever of these Four a Christian understands these Words of our Saviour to be meant by him, is he not obliged in that
Sense

Sense to believe them to be true, and assent to them? Or can he be a Christian, and understand these Words to be meant by our Saviour in one Sense, and deny his Assent to them as true, in that Sense? Would not this be to deny our Saviour's Veracity, and consequently his being the *Messiah* sent from God? And yet this is put upon a Christian, where he understands the Scripture in one Sense, and is required to believe it in another. From all which 'tis evident, that to say there is One, or any Number of Articles necessary to be known and believed to make a Man a Christian, and that there are others contained in the Scripture, which a Man is obliged to endeavour to understand, and obliged also to assent to, as he does understand them, is no Contradiction.

To believe Jesus to be the Messiah, and to take him to be his Lord and King, let us suppose to be that only which is necessary to make a Man a Christian: May it not yet be necessary for him, being a Christian, to study the Doctrine and Law of this his Lord and King, and believe that all that he delivered is true? Is there any Contradiction in holding of this? But this *Creed-maker*, to make sure Work, and not to fail of a Contradiction in Mr. *Bold's* Words, mis-repeats them, *p.* 241. and quite contrary both to what they are in the Sermon,

mon, and what they are as set down by the *Creed-maker* himself, in the immediately preceding Page. Mr. *Bold* says, "There are other Points that Jesus Christ hath taught and revealed, which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to understand; and which being known to be revealed by Christ, he must indispensibly assent to." From which the *Creed-maker* argues thus, p. 240. *Now if there be other Points and particular Articles, and those many, which a sincere Christian is obliged, and that necessarily and indispensibly to understand, believe, and assent to; then this Writer hath in effect yielded to that Proposition I maintained, viz. That the Belief of one Article is not sufficient to make a Man a Christian; and, consequently, he runs counter to the Proposition he had laid down.*

Is there no Difference, I beseech you, between being *indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand, and being indispensibly obliged to understand any Point?* 'Tis the first of these Mr. *Bold* says, and 'tis the latter of these you argue from, and so conclude nothing against him; nor can you to your Purpose. For till Mr. *Bold* says (which he is far from saying) that every sincere Christian is necessarily and indispensibly obliged to understand all those Texts of Scripture, from whence you
I should

should have drawn your necessary Articles (when you have perfected your Creed) in the same Sense that you do, you can conclude nothing against what he had said concerning that one Article, or any thing that looks like *running counter* to it. For it may be enough to constitute a Man a Christian, and one of Christ's Subjects, to take Jesus to be the Messiah, his appointed King, and yet without a Contradiction to that, it may be his indispensable Duty, as a Subject of that Kingdom, to endeavour to understand all the Dictates of his Sovereign, and to assent to the Truth of them, as far as he understands them.

But that which the good *Creed-maker* aims at, without which all his necessary Articles fall, is, that it should be granted him, that every sincere Christian was *necessarily and indispensibly obliged* to understand all those Parts of divine Revelation, from whence he pretends to draw his Articles, in their true Meaning; *i. e.* just as he does. But his Infallibility is not yet so established, but that there will need some Proof of that Proposition. And when he has proved that every sincere Christian is *necessarily and indispensibly obliged* to understand those Texts in their true Meaning, and that his Interpretation of them is that true Meaning; I shall then ask him, Whether *every sincere Christian is not as necessa-*

necessarily and indispensibly obliged to understand other Texts of Scripture in their true Meaning, though they have no Place in his System?

For Example, to make use of the Instance above-mentioned; Is not every sincere Christian *necessarily and indispensibly* obliged to endeavour to understand these Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*, that he may know what he receives in the Sacrament? Does he cease to be a Christian, who happens not to understand them just as the *Creed-maker* does? Or may not the old Gentleman at *Rome* (who has somewhat the antienter Title to Infallibility) make Transubstantiation a Fundamental Article necessary to be believed there, as well as the *Creed-maker* here makes his Sense of any disputed Text of Scripture a Fundamental Article necessary to be believed?

Let us suppose Mr. *Bold* had said, that, instead of *one Point*, the right Knowledge of the *Creed-maker's* one hundred Points (when he has resolved on them) doth constitute and make a Person a Christian; yet there are many other Points Jesus Christ hath taught and revealed, which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand, and to make a due Use of: For this, I think, the *Creed-maker* will not deny. From whence, in

338 *A Second Vindication of the*
the *Creed-maker's* Words, I will thus argue:
Now if there be other Points and particular
Articles; and those many, which a sincere
Christian is obliged, and that necessarily and
indispensibly to understand and believe, and
assent to; then this Writer doth in effect
yield to that Proposition which I maintained,
viz. That the Belief of those one hundred
Articles is not sufficient to make a Man a
Christian: For this is that which I main-
tain; that, upon this Ground, the Belief
of the Articles which he has set down in
his List, are not sufficient to make a Man
a Christian; and that upon Mr. *Bold's*
Reason, which the *Creed-maker* insists on
against one *Article*, viz. because there are
many other Points Jesus Christ hath taught
and revealed, which every sincere Chri-
stian is as necessarily and indispensibly ob-
liged to endeavour to understand, and make
a due Use of.

But this *Creed-maker* is cautious, beyond
any of his Predecessors: He will not be so
caught by his own Argument; and there-
fore is very shy to give you the precise
Articles that every sincere Christian is ne-
cessarily and indispensibly obliged to un-
derstand, and give his Assent to. Some-
thing he is sure there is, that he is indis-
pensibly obliged to understand and assent
to, to make him a Christian; but what
that is, he cannot yet tell. So that whe-

ther he be a Christian or no, he does not know; and what other People will think of him, from his treating of the serious Things of Christianity in so trifling and scandalous a Way, must be left to them.

In the next Paragraph, *p. 242.* the *Creed-maker* tells us, *Mr. Bold goes on to confute himself, in saying, "A true Christian must assent unto this, that Christ " Jesus is God."* But this is just such another Confutation of himself as the before-mentioned, *i. e.* as much as a Falshood substituted by another Man can be a Confutation of a Man's self, who has spoken Truth all of a-piece. For the *Creed-maker*, according to his sure Way of *baffling* his Opponents, so as to leave them nothing to answer, hath here, as he did before, changed *Mr. Bold's* Words; which in the 35th Page, quoted by the *Creed-maker*, stand thus: "When a true Christian understands that Christ Jesus hath taught that *he is a God*, he must assent unto it:" Which is true and conformable to what he had said before, That every sincere Christian must endeavour to understand the Points taught and reveal'd by Jesus Christ; which being known to be reveal'd by him, he must assent unto.

The like Piece of Honesty the *Creed-maker* shews in the next Paragraph, *p. 243.* where he charges *Mr. Bold* with saying,

That a true Christian is as much obliged to believe that the Holy Spirit is God, as to believe that Jesus is the Christ. P. 40. In which Place Mr. *Bold's* Words are; "When
" a true Christian understands that Christ
" Jesus hath given this Account of the
" Holy Spirit, viz. that *he is God*; he is
" as much obliged to believe it, as he is
" to believe that *Jesus is the Christ*:" Which is an uncontestable Truth; but such an one as the *Creed-maker* himself saw would do him no Service, and therefore he mangles it, and leaves out half to serve his Turn. But he that should give a Testimony in the slight Affairs of Men, and their temporal Concerns, before a Court of Judicature, as the *Creed-maker* does here, and almost every where, in the great Affairs of Religion, and the everlasting Concern of Souls, before all Mankind, would lose his Ears for it. What therefore this worthy Gentleman alledges out of Mr. *Bold*, as a Contradiction to himself, being only the *Creed-maker's* Contradiction to Truth and clear Matter of Fact, needs no other Answer.

The rest of what he calls *Reflections on Mr. Bold's Sermon*, being nothing but either rude and misbecoming Language of him, or pitiful, childish Application to him, to change his Persuasion at the *Creed-maker's* Entreaty, and give up the Truth
he

he hath own'd, in courtesy to this doughty Combatant, shews the Ability of the Man. Leave off begging the Question, and superciliously presuming that you are in the right; and, instead of that, shew it by Argument: And I dare answer for Mr. *Bold*, you will have him; and I promise you, with him, one Convert more. But Arguing is not, it seems, this notable Disputant's Way. If boasting of himself, and contemning others, false Quotations, and feigned Matters of Fact, which the Reader neither can know, nor is the Question concerned in it if he did know, will not do, there is an End of him: He has shewn his Excellency in scurrilous Declamation; and there you have the whole of this unanswerable Writer. And for this, I appeal to his own Writings in this Controversy, if any judicious Reader can have the Patience to look them over.

In the Beginning of his *Reflections on Mr. Bold's Sermon*, he confidently tells the World, That *he had found that the Manager of the Reasonableness of Christianity had prevailed on Mr. Bold to preach a Sermon upon his Reflections, &c.* And adds, *And we cannot but think that that Man must speak the Truth, and defend it very impartially and substantially, who is thus brought on to undertake the Cause.* And at the latter end he addresses himself to

Mr. *Bold*, as one that is *drawn off* to be an under Journeyman-Worker in *Socinianism*. In his gracious Allowance, Mr. *Bold* is *seemingly a Man of some Relish of Religion and Piety*, p. 244. He is forc'd also to own him to be a Man of *Sobriety and Temper*, p. 245. A very good Rise, to give him out to the World, in the very next Words, as a Man of a profligate Conscience! For so he must be, who can be *drawn off* to preach or write for *Socinianism*, when he thinks it a most dangerous Error; who can *dissemble with himself*, and *choak his inward Persuasions* (as the *Creed-maker* insinuates that Mr. *Bold* does, in the same Address to him, p. 248.) and write contrary to his Light. Had the *Creed-maker* had reason to think in earnest that Mr. *Bold* was going off to *Socinianism*, he might have reason'd with him fairly, as with a Man running into dangerous Error: Or if he had certainly known that he was by any By-ends prevail'd on to undertake a Cause contrary to his Conscience, he might have some reason to tell the World, as he does, p. 239. *That we cannot think he should speak Truth, who is thus brought to undertake a Cause.* If he does not certainly know that Mr. *Bold* was *THUS* brought to undertake the Cause, he could not have shewn a more villainous and unchristian Mind, than in publishing such a

Cha-

Character of a Minister of the Gospel, and a worthy Man, upon no other Grounds, but because it might be subservient to his Ends. He is engag'd in a Controversy, that by Argument he cannot maintain; nor knew any other Way from the Beginning, to attack the Book he pretends to write against, but by crying out *Socinianism*! A Name he knows in great Disgrace with all other Sects of Christians; and therefore sufficient to deter all those who approve and condemn Books by Hearsay, without examining their Truth themselves, from perusing a Treatise to which he could affix that Imputation. Mr. *Bold's* Name (who is publickly known to be no *Socinian*) he foresees will wipe off that false Imputation, with a great many of those who are led by Names more than Things. This seems exceedingly to trouble him; and he labours, Might and Main, to get Mr. *Bold* to quit a Book as *Socinian*, which Mr. *Bold* knows is not *Socinian*, because he has read and considered it.

But though our *Creed-maker* be mightily concern'd that Mr. *B—d* should not appear in the Defence of it; yet this Concern cannot raise him one jot above that Honesty, Skill, and good Breeding, which appears towards others. He manages this Matter with Mr. *B—d* as he has done the

344 *A Second Vindication of the*
rest of the Controversy; just in the same
Strain of Invention, Civility, Wit, and
good Sense. He tells him, besides what
I have above set down, *That he is drawn*
off to debase himself and the Post, i. e. the
Ministry, he is in, p. 245. That he hath
said very ill Things, to the lessening and im-
pairing, yea, to the defaming of that Know-
ledge and Belief of our Saviour, and of the
Articles of Christianity, which are necessa-
rily requir'd of us, p. 245. That the De-
vout and Pious (whereby he means him-
self, for one and none is his own beloved
Wit and Argument) *observing that Mr. Bold*
is come to the Necessity of but ONE Article
of Faith, they expect that he may in time
hold that NONE is necessary, p. 248.
That if he writes again in the same Strain,
he will write rather like a Turkish Spy,
than a Christian Preacher. That he is a
Backslider, and sailing to Racovia with a
Side-Wind. Than which, what can there
be more scurrilous, or more malicious?
And yet, at the same Time that he out-
rages him thus, beyond not only what
Christian Charity, but common Civility
would allow in an ingenuous Adversary,
he makes some aukward Attempts to sooth
him, with some ill-tim'd Commendations;
and would have his under-valuing Mr. Bold's
Animadversions pass for a Compliment to
him; because he, for that Reason, pre-
tends

tends not to believe *so crude and shallow a Thing* (as he is pleased to call it) to be his. A notable Contrivance to gain the greater Liberty of railing at him under another Name, when Mr. B—d's, it seems, is too well known to serve him so well to that Purpose! Besides, it is of good Use to fill up three or four Pages of his *Reflections*: A great Convenience to a Writer, who knows all the Ways of *baffling* his Opponents, but Argument; and who always makes a great deal of Stir about Matters foreign to his Subject; which, whether they are granted or denied, make nothing at all to the Truth of the Question on either side. For, what is it to the *Shallowness*, or Depth of the *Animadversions*, who writ them? Or to the Truth or Falshood of Mr. B—d's Defence of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, whether a *Layman*, or a *Churchman*, a *Socinian*, or one of the *Church of England*, answer'd the *Creed-maker* as well as he? Yet this is argued as a Matter of great Weight: But yet, in reality, it amounts to no more but this; that a Man of any Denomination, who wishes well to the Peace of Christianity, and has observed the horrible Effects the Christian Religion has felt from the impositions of Men in Matters of Faith, may have reason to defend a Book, wherein the Simplicity of the Gospel, and the Do-

I

ctrine

ctrine proposed by our Saviour and his Apostles, for the Conversion of Unbelievers, is made out, though there be not one Word of the distinguishing Tenets of his Sect in it. But that all those, who under any Name are for imposing their own Orthodoxy, as necessary to be believed, and persecuting those who dissent from them, should be all against it, is not perhaps very strange.

One Thing more I must observe of the *Creed-maker* on this Occasion: In his *Socinian Creed*, Chap. VI. the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. and his Book, must be judg'd of by the Characters and Writings of those, who entertain or commend his Notions. *A profess'd Unitarian has defended it*; therefore he is a *Socinian*. The Author of a *Letter to the Deists* speaks well of it; therefore he is a *Deist*. Another, as an Abetter of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, he mentions p. 125. whose Letters I have never seen: And his Opinions too are, I suppose, set down there as belonging to me. Whatever is bad in the Tenets or Writings of these Men, infects me. But the Mischief is, Mr. *Bold's* Orthodoxy will do me no good: But because he has defended my Book against Mr. *Edwards*, all my Faults are become his, and he has a mighty Load of Accusations laid upon him. Thus contrary

trary Causes serve so good a natur'd, so charitable, and candid a Writer as the *Creed-maker*, to the same Purpose of Censure and Railing. But I shall desire him to figure to himself the Loveliness of that Creature, which turns every thing into Venom. What others are, or hold, who have express'd favourable Thoughts of my Book, I think my self not concern'd in. What Opinions others have publish'd, make those in my Book neither true nor false; and he that for the sake of Truth would confute the Errors in it, should shew their Falshood and Weakness, as they are there: But they who write for other Ends than Truth, are always busy with other Matters; and where they can do nothing by Reason and Argument, hope to prevail with some by borrow'd Prejudices and Party.

Taking therefore the *Animadversions*, as well as the *Sermon*, to be his whose Name they bear, I shall leave to Mr. B—d himself to take what Notice he thinks fit of the little Sense, as well as great Impudence, of putting his Name in Print to what is not his, or taking it away from what he hath set it to, whether it belongs to his Bookseller or Answerer. Only I cannot pass by the palpable Falsifying of Mr. B—d's Words, in the Beginning of his Epistle to the Reader, without mention.

Mr.

Mr. B—'s Words are; "Whereby I came
 " to be furnished with a truer and more
 " just Notion of the main Design of that
 " *TREATISE*." And the good *Creed-*
maker sets them down thus; *The main*
Design of MY OWN TREATISE, OR
SERMON: A sure Way for such a Cham-
pion for Truth to secure to himself the
Laurel, or the Whetstone!

This irresistible Disputant (who silences
 all that come in his Way, so that those
 that would, cannot answer him) to make
 good the mighty Encômiums he has given
 himself, ought (one would think) to clear
 all as he goes, and leave nothing by the
 way unanswer'd, for fear he should fall
 into the Number of those poor *baffled*
Wretches, whom he with so much Scorn
 reproaches, that they *would answer if they*
could.

Mr. B—d begins his *Animadversions* with
 this Remark, That our *Creed-maker* had
 said, that *I give it over and over again in*
these formal Words, viz. *That nothing is*
required to be believed by any Christian Man
but this, That Jesus is the Messiah. To
 which Mr. B—d replies, *p. 4.* in these
 Words: "Though I have read over the
 " *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. with
 " some Attention, I have not observ'd
 " those formal Words in any Part of that
 " Book, nor any Words that are capable
 " of

“ of that Construction ; provided they be
“ considered with the Relation they have
“ to, and the manifest Dependence they
“ have on what goes before, or follows
“ after them.”

BUT TO THIS *Mr. Edwards* ANSWERS
NOT.

Whether it was because *he would not*, or
because *he could not*, let the Reader judge.
But this is down upon his Score already,
and it is expected he should answer to it,
or else confess that he *cannot*. And that
there may be a fair Decision of this Dis-
pute, I expect the same Usage from him,
that he should set down any Proposition
of his I have not answer'd to, and call
on me for an Answer, if *I can* ; and if
I cannot, I promise him to own it in
Print.

The *Creed-maker* had said, *That it is
most evident, to any thinking and considerate
Person, that I purposely omit the Epistolary
Writings of the Apostles, because they are
fraught with other Fundamental Doctrines,
besides that which I mention.*

To this *Mr. B—d* answers, *p. 5.* That
if, by “ *Fundamental Articles*, *Mr. Ed-*
“ *wards* means here all the Propositions
“ deliver'd in the Epistles, concerning just
“ those particular Heads he [*Mr. Edwards*]
“ had there mentioned ; it lies upon him
“ to prove, That Jesus Christ hath made
“ it

“ it necessary that every Person must have
 “ an explicit Knowledge and Belief of all
 “ those, before he can be a Christian.”

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS
 NOT.

And yet without an Answer to it, all his
 Talk about *Fundamentals*, and those which
 he pretended to set down in that Place,
 under the Name of *Fundamentals*, will
 signify nothing in the present Case; where-
 in, by *Fundamentals*, were meant such
 Propositions which every Person must ne-
 cessarily have an explicit Knowledge and
 Belief of, before he can be a Christian.

Mr. *B—d*, in the same Place, *p.* 6, 7.
 very truly and pertinently adds, “ That
 “ it did not pertain to [my] Undertaking,
 “ to enquire what Doctrines, either in the
 “ *Epistles*, or the *Evangelists* and the *Acts*,
 “ were of greatest Moment to be under-
 “ stood by them who are Christians; but
 “ what was necessary to be known and be-
 “ liev’d, to a Person’s being a Christian.
 “ For there are many important Doctrines,
 “ both in the *Gospels* and in the *Acts*, be-
 “ sides this, *That Jesus is the Messiah*.
 “ But how many soever the Doctrines be,
 “ which are taught in the *Epistles*, if there
 “ be no Doctrine besides this, *That Jesus*
 “ *is the Messiah*, taught there as necessary
 “ to be believed to make a Man a Chri-
 “ stian; all the Doctrines taught there
 “ will

“ will not make any thing against what
“ this Author has asserted, nor against the
“ Method he hath observed: Especially,
“ considering we have an Account, in the
“ *Acts of the Apostles*, of what those Per-
“ sons, by whom the Epistles were writ,
“ did teach, as necessary to be believ’d to
“ Peoples being Christians.”

This, and what Mr. *B—d* subjoins,
“ That it was not my Design to give an
“ Abstract of any of the inspir’d Books,”
is so true, and has so clear Reason in it,
that any but this Writer would have
thought himself concern’d to have an-
swer’d something to it.

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS
NOT.

It not being, it seems, a *Creed-maker’s*
Business to convince Mens Understanding
by Reason; but to impose on their Belief
by Authority, or, where that is want-
ing, by Falshood and Bawling; to such
Mr. *Bold* observes well, *p. 8.* “ That if I
“ had given the like Account of the Epi-
“ stles, that would have been as little sa-
“ tisfactory as what I have done already,
“ to those who are resolved not to distin-
“ guish *betwixt what is necessary to be be-*
“ *lieved to make a Man a Christian, and*
“ *those Articles which are to be believed*
“ *by those who are Christians, as they can*
“ attain

“attain to know that Christ hath taught
“them.”

This Distinction the *Creed-maker* nowhere, that I remember, takes any Notice of; unless it be *p. 255.* where he has something relating hereunto, which we shall consider when we come to that Place. I shall now go on to shew what Mr. *Bold* has said, to which he answers not.

Mr. *Bold* farther tells him, *p. 10.* That if he will prove any thing in opposition to the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. it must be this; “That Jesus Christ and
“his Apostles have taught, that the Be-
“lief of some one Article, or certain
“Number of Articles distinct from this,
“*That Jesus is the Messiah*, either as ex-
“clusive of, or in conjunction with the
“Belief of this Article, doth constitute
“and make a Person a Christian: But that
“the Belief of this, That Jesus is the
“Messiah, alone, doth not make a Man
“a Christian.”

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* IRREFRAGABLY ANSWERS NOTHING.

Mr. *Bold* also, *p. 10.* charges him with his falsely accusing me, in these Words: *He pretends to contend for one single Article, with the Exclusion of all the rest, for this Reason; because all Men ought to understand their Religion.* And again, where he says

I aim at this, *viz.* That we must not have any Point of Doctrine in our Religion, that the Mob doth not at the very first naming of it perfectly understand and agree to; Mr. Bold has quoted my express Words to the contrary.

BUT TO THIS, this unanswerable Gentleman ANSWERS NOTHING.

But if he be such a mighty Disputant, that nothing can stand in his Way; I shall expect his direct Answer to it, among those other Propositions which I have set down to his Score, and require him to prove if he can.

The *Creed-maker* spends above four Pages of his *Reflections* in a great Stir who is the Author of those *Animadversions* he is reflecting on. To which, I tell him, it matters not to a Lover of Truth, or a Confuter of Errors, who was the Author, but what they contain. He, who makes such a deal of do about that which is nothing to the Question, shews he has but little mind to the Argument; that his Hopes are more in the Recommendation of Names, and Prejudice of Parties, than in the Strength of his Reasons, and the Goodness of his Cause. A Lover of Truth follows That, whoever be for or against it; and can suffer himself to pass by no Argument of his Adversary, without taking notice of it, either in allowing its Force, or giving it

a fair Answer. Were the *Creed-maker* capable of giving such an Evidence as this, of his Love of Truth, he would not have pass'd over the first Twenty Pages of Mr. *Bold's Animadversions* in Silence. The Falshoods that are therein charged upon him, would have requir'd an Answer of him, if he *could* have given any: And I tell him he must give an Answer, or confess the Falshoods.

In his 255th Page, he comes to take notice of these Words of Mr. *Bold*, in the 21st Page of his *Animadversions*, viz. "That a Convert to Christianity, or a Christian, must necessarily believe as many Articles, as he shall attain to know that Jesus Christ hath taught." Which, says the *Creed-maker*, wholly invalidates what he had said before in these Words, viz. "That Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, did not teach any thing as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, but only this one Proposition, That Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah." The Reason he gives to shew that the former of these Propositions (in Mr. *Bold*) invalidates the latter, and that the *Animadverter* contradicts himself, stands thus: For, says he, if a Christian must give Assent to all the Articles taught by our Saviour in the Gospel, and that necessarily; then all those Propositions reckon'd up in my

I

late

late Discourse, being taught by Christ or his Apostles, are necessary to be believed.

Answ. And what, I beseech you, becomes of the rest of the Propositions taught by Christ, or his Apostles, which you have not reckon'd up in your late Discourse? Are not they necessary to be believed, if a Christian must give an Assent to ALL the Articles taught by our Saviour and his Apostles?

Sir, if you will argue right from that Antecedent, it must stand thus: *If a Christian must give an Assent to ALL the Articles taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, and that necessarily*; then all the Propositions in the New Testament, taught by Christ or his Apostles, are necessarily to be believed. This Consequence I grant to be true, and necessarily to follow from that Antecedent; and pray make your best of it: But withal remember, that it puts an utter End to your select Number of Fundamentals, and makes all the Truths delivered in the New Testament necessary to be explicitly believed by every Christian.

But, Sir, I must take notice to you, that if it be uncertain whether he that writ the *Animadversions* be the same Person that preached the Sermon, yet it is very visible that 'tis the very same Person that reflects on both; because he here again uses the

356 *A Second Vindication of the*
same Trick in answering, in the *Animad-*
versions, the same Thing that had been
said in the *Sermon*, viz. by pretending to
argue from Words as Mr. *Bold's*, when
Mr. *Bold* has said no such Thing. The
Proposition you argue from here, is this:
If a Christian must give Assent to all the
Articles taught by our Saviour, and that
necessarily. But Mr. *Bold* says no such
Thing. His Words, as set down by your
self, are: "A Christian must necessarily
" believe as many Articles as he shall at-
" tain to know that Christ Jesus hath
" taught." And is there no Difference,
between *ALL that Christ Jesus hath taught,*
and *AS MANY as any one shall attain to*
know that Christ Jesus hath taught? There
is so great a Difference between these two,
that one can scarce think even such a *Creed-*
maker could mistake it. For one of them
admits all those to be Christians, who ta-
king *Jesus* for the *Messiah*, their Lord and
King, sincerely apply themselves to under-
stand and obey his Doctrine and Law, and
do believe all that they understand to be
taught by him: The other shuts out, if
not all Mankind, yet Nine Hundred Ninety
Nine of a Thousand, of those who profess
themselves Christians, from being really so.
For he speaks within Compass, who says
there is not one of a Thousand, if there be
any one Man at all, who explicitly knows
and

and believes all that our Saviour and his Apostles taught; *i. e.* all that is delivered in the New Testament, in the true Sense that it is there intended. For if giving Assent to it, in any Sense, will serve the Turn, our *Creed-maker* can have no Exceptions against *Socinians*, *Papists*, *Lutherans*, or any other, who, though they acknowledge the Scripture to be the Word of God, do yet oppose his System.

But the *Creed-maker* goes on, *p.* 255. and endeavours to prove, that what is necessary to be believed by every Christian, is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, in these Words: *But he will say, the Belief of those Propositions makes not a Man a Christian. Then, I say, they are not necessary and indispensable; for what is absolutely necessary in Christianity, is absolutely requisite to make a Man a Christian.*

Ignorance, or something worse, makes our *Creed-maker* always speak doubtfully or obscurely, whenever he pretends to argue; for here, *absolutely necessary in Christianity*, either signifies nothing, but absolutely necessary to make a Man a Christian; and then it is proving the same Proposition by the same Proposition: Or else, has a very obscure and doubtful Signification. For, if I ask him whether it *be absolutely necessary in Christianity* to obey

every one of our Saviour's Commands, what will he answer me? If he answers *NO*; I ask him, which of our Saviour's Commands is it not, *in Christianity, absolutely necessary* to obey? If he answers *YES*; then I tell him, by his Rule, there are no Christians; because there is no one that does, in all Things, obey all our Saviour's Commands, and therein fails to perform what is *absolutely necessary in Christianity*; and so, by his Rule, is no Christian. If he answers, sincere Endeavour to obey, is all that is *absolutely necessary*; I reply, and so sincere Endeavour to understand, is all that is *absolutely necessary*: Neither perfect Obedience, nor perfect Understanding, is *absolutely necessary in Christianity*.

But this Proposition being put in Terms clear, and not loose and fallacious, should stand thus, *viz. What is absolutely necessary to every Christian, is absolutely requisite to make a Man a Christian*. But then I deny that he can infer, from Mr. Bold's Words, that those Propositions (*i. e.* which he has set down as fundamental, or necessary to be believed) are *absolutely necessary* to be believed by every Christian. For that indispensable Necessity Mr. Bold speaks of, is not absolute, but conditional. His Words are; *A Christian must believe as many Articles as he shall attain to know that Jesus Christ*

Christ hath taught. So that he places the indispensable Necessity of Believing, upon the Condition of attaining to know that Christ taught so. An Endeavour to know what *Jesus Christ* taught, Mr. B—d says truly, is *absolutely necessary* to every one who is a Christian; and to believe what he has attained to know that *Jesus Christ* taught, that also, he says, is *absolutely necessary* to every Christian. But all this granted (as true it is) it still remains (and eternally will remain) to be proved from this (which is all that Mr. *Bold* says) that something else is absolutely required to make a Man a Christian, besides the unfeigned taking *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, his King and Lord; and, accordingly, a sincere Resolution to obey and believe all that he commanded and taught.

The Jailor, *Acts* xvi. 34. in answer to this Question, what he should *do to be saved?* was answer'd, that *he should believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.* And the Text says, that the Jailor *took them the same Hour of the Night, and washed their Stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway.* Now I will ask our *Creed-maker*, whether St. *Paul*, in speaking to him the *Word of the Lord*, propos'd and explain'd to him all those Propositions, and *Fundamental Heads of Doctrine.* which our *Creed-maker* has set down as necessary to be be-

lieved to make a Man a Christian. Let it be consider'd the Jailor was a Heathen, and one that seems to have no more Sense of Religion or Humanity, than those of that Calling use to have: For he had let them alone under the Pain of their Stripes without any Remedy, or so much as the Ease of washing them, from the Day before, till after his Conversion; which was not till after Midnight. And can any one think, that between his asking what he should *do to be saved*, and his being *baptized*, which the Text says was *the same Hour*, and *straightway*, there was Time enough for St. *Paul* and *Silas* to explain to him all the *Creed-maker's* Articles, and make such a Man as that, and all his House, understand the *Creed-maker's* whole System: Especially, since we hear nothing of it in the Conversion of these, or any others, who were brought into the Faith, in the whole History of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles? Now let me ask our *Creed-maker*, whether the Jailor was not a Christian, when he was baptized; and whether, if he had then immediately died, he had not been saved, without the Belief of any one Article more than what *Paul* and *Silas* had then taught him? Whence it follows, that what was then proposed to him to be believed (which appears to be nothing but that *Jesus* was the

the *Messiah*) was all that was absolutely necessary to be believed to make him a Christian; though this hinders not but that afterwards it might be necessary for him, indispensibly necessary, to believe other Articles, when he attained to the Knowledge that Christ had taught them. And the Reason of it is plain: Because the knowing that Christ hath taught any Thing, and the not receiving it for true (which is believing it) is inconsistent with the believing him to be the *Messiah*, sent from God to enlighten and save the World. Every Word of Divine Revelation is absolutely and indispensibly necessary to be believed by every Christian, as soon as he comes to know it to be taught by our Saviour or his Apostles, or to be of divine Revelation. But yet this is far enough from making it absolutely necessary to every Christian to know every Text in the Scripture, much less to understand every Text in the Scripture; and least of all to understand it as the *Creed-maker* is pleased to put his Sense upon it.

This the good *Creed-maker* either will not, or cannot understand; but gives us a List of Articles cull'd out of the Scripture by his own Authority, and tells us those are absolutely necessary to be believed by every one, to make him a Christian. For what is of *absolute Necessity in Christianity*,

slianity, as those he says are, he tells us is absolutely requisite to *make a Man a Christian*. But when he is ask'd, whether these are all the Articles of absolute Necessity to be believed to make a Man a Christian; this worthy Divine, that takes upon him to be a Successor of the Apostles, cannot tell. And yet, having taken upon him also to be a *Creed-maker*, he must suffer himself to be called upon for it again and again, till he tells us what is of absolute Necessity to be believed to make a Man a Christian, or confesses that he cannot.

In the mean time, I take the Liberty to say that every Proposition delivered in the New Testament, by our Saviour or his Apostles, and so received by any Christian as of divine Revelation, is of as absolute Necessity to be assented to by him, in the Sense he understands it to be taught by them, as any one of those Propositions enumerated by the *Creed-maker*: And if he thinks otherwise, I shall desire him to prove it. The Reason whereof is this; That in divine Revelation the Ground of Faith being only the Authority of the Proposer, where that is the same, there is no Difference in the Obligation, or Measure of believing. Whatever the *Messiah* that came from God taught, is equally to be believed by every one who receives him as the *Messiah*, as soon as he understands what
it

it was he taught. There is no such thing as garbling his Doctrine, and making one Part of it more necessary to be believed than another, when it is understood. His Saying is, and must be of unquestionable Authority to all that receive him as their heavenly King; and carries with it an equal Obligation of Assent to all that he says as true. But since no body can explicitly assent to any Proposition of our Saviour's as true, but in the Sense he understands our Saviour to have spoken it in; the same Authority of the *Messiah*, his King, obliges every one absolutely and indispensibly to believe every Part of the New Testament in that Sense he understands it: For else he rejects the Authority of the Deliverer, if he refuses his Assent to it in that Sense which he is persuaded it was delivered in. But the taking him for the *Messiah*, his King and Lord, laying upon every one who is his Subject an Obligation to endeavour to know his Will in all Things; every true Christian is under an absolute and indispensable Necessity, by being his Subject, to study the Scriptures with unprejudic'd Mind, according to that Measure of Time, Opportunity, and Helps, which he has; that in these sacred Writings he may find what his Lord and Master hath by himself, or by the Mouths of his
Apostles,

364 *A Second Vindication of the*
Apostles, requir'd of him, either to be believed or done.

The *Creed-maker*, in the following Page, 256. hath these Words: *It is worth the Reader's observing, That notwithstanding I had in twelve Pages together (viz. from the Eighth to Twentieth) prov'd that several Propositions are necessary to be believ'd by us, in order to our being Christians; yet this Sham-Animadverter attends not to any one of the Particulars which I had mentioned, nor offers any thing against them; but only, in a lumping Way, dooms them all in those magisterial Words, I do not see any Proofs he produces, p. 21. This is his wonderful Way of confuting me, by pretending that he cannot see any Proof in what I alledge; and all the World must be led by his Eyes.*

Ans^w. *It is worth the Reader's observing, that the Creed-maker does not reply to what Mr. Bold has said to him, as we have already seen, and shall see more as we go on; and therefore he has little reason to complain of him, for not having answer'd enough. Mr. Bold did well to leave that which was an insignificant Lump so as it was, together: For 'tis no wonderful Thing not to see any Proof, where there is no Proof. There is indeed, in those Pages the Creed-maker mentions, much*
Con-

Confidence, much Assertion, a great many Questions asked, and a great deal said after this Fashion: But for a Proof, I deny there is any one. And if what I have said in another Place already, does not convince him of it, I challenge him, with all his *Eyes*, and those of the *World* to boot, to find out, in those Twelve renown'd Pages, one Proof. Let him set down the Proposition, and his Proof of its being absolutely and indispensibly necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; and I too will join with him, in his Testimonial of himself, that he is *irrefragable*. But I must tell him, before-hand, talking a great deal loosely will not do it.

Mr. *Bold* and I say we cannot see any Proof in those Twelve Pages: The way to make us *see*, or to convince the World that we are blind, is to single out one Proof, out of that Wood of Words there, which you seem to take for Arguments, and set it down in a Syllogism; which is the fair Trial of a Proof, or no Proof. You have indeed a Syllogism in the 23d Page, but that is not in those Twelve Pages you mention. Besides, I have shew'd, in another Place, what that proves: To which I refer you.

In answer to the *Creed-maker's* Question, about his other Fundamentals found in the Epistles; *Why did the Apostles write these Doctrines?*

366 *A Second Vindication of the*
Doctrines? Was it not, that those they
writ to, might give their Assent to them?
Mr. Bold, p. 22. replies; " But then it
" may be asked again, Were not those
" Persons Christians, to whom the Apo-
" stles writ *these Doctrines*, and whom
" they requir'd to assent to them? Yes,
" verily: And if so, What was it that
" made them Christians before their As-
" sent to *these Doctrines* was requir'd?
" If it were any thing besides their belie-
" ving *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, it ought to
" be instanced in, and made out."

BUT TO THIS Mr. Edwards ANSWERS
NOT.

The next Thing in Controversy, be-
tween Mr. Bold and the *Creed-maker* (for
I follow Mr. B—d's Order) is about a
Matter of Fact, viz. Whether the *Creed-*
maker has prov'd " that *Jesus Christ*, and
" his Apostles, have taught that no Man
" can be a Christian, or shall be sav'd,
" unless he have an explicit *Knowledge of*
" *all those Things which have an immediate*
" *Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way,*
" *Means and Issue of our Salvation, and*
" *which are necessary for the knowing the*
" *true Nature and Design of it?*" This,
Mr. Bold, p. 24. tells him, " he has not
" done." To this the *Creed-maker* re-
plies, p. 258.

And

And yet the Reader may satisfy himself, that this is the very Thing that I had been proving just before; and indeed all along, in the foregoing Chapter. Answ. There have been those who have been seven Years proving a Thing, which at last they could not do: And I give you seven Years to prove this Proposition which you should there have prov'd, and I must add to your Score here, viz.

LII. *That Jesus Christ, or his Apostles, have taught that no Man can be a Christian, or can be saved, unless he hath an explicit Knowledge of all those Things which have an immediate Respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of our Salvation; and which are necessary for our knowing the true Nature and Design of it.*

Nor must the poor Excuse, of saying it was not necessary to add any farther Medium, and proceed to another Syllogism, because you had secured that Proposition before, go for Payment. If you had secur'd it, as you say, it had been quite as easy, and much more for your Credit, to have produc'd the Proof whereby you had secur'd it, than to say you had done it; and thereupon to reproach Mr. Bold with *Heedlessness,*

lesness, and to tell the World that *he cares not what he saith*. The Rule of fair Dispute is indispensibly to prove, where any Thing is denied. To evade this, is shuffling; and he that, instead of it, answers with ill Language, in my Country is call'd a *Foul-mouth'd Wrangler*.

To the *Creed-maker's* Exception to my Demand, about the *actual* Belief of all his *Fundamentals* in his new *Creed*, Mr. *Bold* asks, p. 24. "Whether a Man can believe particular Propositions, and not *actually* believe them?"

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

Mr. *Bold*, p. 25. farther acknowledges the *Creed-maker's* fundamental Propositions to "be in the Bible; and that they are for this Purpose there, that they might be believed:" And so, he saith, "is every other Proposition which is taught in our Bibles:" But asks, "How will it thence follow, that no Man can be a Christian, till he particularly know, and actually assent to every Proposition in our Bibles?"

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

From p. 26, to 30. Mr. *Bold* shews that the *Creed-maker's* Reply, concerning my not gathering of *Fundamentals* out of the Epistles,

Epistles, is nothing to the Purpose: And this he demonstratively proves.

AND TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

The *Creed-maker* had falsely said, that *I bring no Tidings of an Evangelical Faith*: And thence very readily and charitably infers, *Which gives us to understand, that he verily believes there is no such Christian Faith*. To this Mr. *Bold* thus softly replies, p. 31.

“ I think Mr. *Edwards* is much mistaken, both in his Assertion and Inference.” And to shew that he could not so infer, adds: “ If the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. had not brought any Tidings of such a Faith, I think it could not be thence justly infer’d, that he verily believes there is no such Christian Faith; because his Enquiry and Search was not concerning *Christian Faith*, consider’d subjectively, but objectively; what the Articles be, which must be believed to make a Man a Christian; and not, with what sort of Faith these Articles are to be believed.”

To this the *Creed-maker* answers indeed; but it is something as much worse than nothing, as Falshood is worse than Silence. His Words are, p. 258. *It may be question’d, from what he [the Animadverter] hath the Confidence to say, p. 31 viz There is no Enquiry in the Reasonableness of Christia-*

370 *A Second Vindication of the*
nity, concerning Faith *subjectively* consider'd, but only *objectively*, &c. And thus having set down Mr. B—d's Words otherwise than they are ; for Mr. Bold does not say *there is no Enquiry*, i. e. no Mention (for so the *Creed-maker* explains *Enquiries* here : For to convince Mr. Bold that there is an *Enquiry*, i. e. Mention of *Subjective Faith*, he alledges, that *Subjective Faith* is *spoken of* in the 191st and 192d Pages of my Book) But Mr. Bold says, not that Faith consider'd *subjectively*, is *not spoken of* any where in the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. but “ that the Author's *Enquiry* and *Search* (i. e. the Author's “ *Search*, or *Design* of his *Search*) was “ not concerning *Christian Faith* consider'd *subjectively*.” And thus the *Creed-maker*, imposing on his Reader, by perverting Mr. Bold's Sense, from what was the Intention of my *Enquiry and Search*, to what I had said in it, he goes on, after his scurrilous Fashion, to insult, in these Words which follow: *I say it may be guess'd, from this, what a Liberty this Writer takes, to assert what he pleases.* Answ. *To assert what one pleases*, without Truth, and without Certainty, is the worst Character can be given a Writer: And with Falshood to charge it on another, is no mean Slander and Injury to a Man's Neighbour. And yet to these shameful
Arts

Arts must he be driven, who finding his Strength of managing a Cause to lie only in Fiction and Falshood, has no other but the dull *Billinggate* way of covering it, by endeavouring to divert the Reader's Observation and Censure from himself, by a confident, repeated Imputation of that to his Adversary, which he himself is so frequent in the Commission of. And, of this, the Instances I have given, are a sufficient Proof: In which I have been at the Pains to set down the Words on both Sides, and the Pages where they are to be found, for the Reader's full Satisfaction.

The Cause in Debate between us is of great Weight, and concerns every Christian. That any Evidence in the Proposal, or Defence of it, can be sufficient to conquer all Mens Prejudices, is Vanity to imagine. But this, I think, I may justly demand of every Reader, That since there are great and visible Falshoods on one side or the other (for the Accusations of this kind are positive and frequent) he would examine on which Side they are: And upon that I will venture the Cause in any Reader's Judgment, who will be but at the Pains of turning to the Pages mark'd out to him; and as for him that will not do that, I care not much what he says.

The *Creed-maker's* following Words, p. 258. have the natural Mark of their Author. They are these: *How can this Animadverter come off, with peremptory declaring that Subjective Faith is not enquir'd into, in the Treatise of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. when in another Place, p. 35. and 36. he avers, That Christian Faith and Christianity, consider'd subjectively, are the same? Answ.* In which Words there are two manifest Untruths: The one is, That Mr. Bold peremptorily declares that Subjective Faith is not enquir'd into, i. e. spoken of, in the *Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.* Whereas Mr. Bold says in that Place, p. 31. "If he [i. e. the Author] had not said one Word concerning Faith subjectively consider'd." The *Creed-maker's* other Untruth, is his saying, *That the Animadverter avers, p. 35. 36. that Christian Faith and Christianity, consider'd subjectively, are the same.* Whereas 'tis evident that Mr. Bold, arguing against these Words of the *Creed-maker* (*The Belief of Jesus being the Messiah, was one of the first and leading Acts of Christian Faith*) speaks in that Place of an *Act of Faith*; as these Words of his demonstrate: "Now I apprehend that Christian Faith
" and Christianity, consider'd subjectively
" (and an *ACT* of Christian Faith, I think,
" cannot be understood in any other Sense)
" are

"are the very same." I must therefore desire him to set down the Words, wherein the *Animadverter* peremptorily declares,

LIII. *That subjective Faith is not enquir'd into, or spoken of, in the Treatise of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.*

And next, to produce the Words wherein the *Animadverter* avers,

LIV. *That Christian Faith and Christianity, consider'd subjectively, are the same.*

To the Creed-maker's saying, *That the Author of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. brings us no Tidings of Evangelical Faith belonging to Christianity*, Mr. Bold replies, That I have done it in all those Pages where I speak of taking and accepting *Jesus* to be our King and Ruler; and particularly he sets down my Words, out of p. 301.

BUT TO THIS Mr. Edwards ANSWERS NOT.

The Creed-maker says, p. 59. of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, that the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity* tells Men, again and again, that a Christian Man, or Member of Christ, needs not know or be-

374 *A Second Vindication of the*
lieve any more than that one individual
Point. To which Mr. *Bold* thus replies,
p. 33. " If any Man will shew me those
" Words, in any part of the *Reasonable-*
" *ness*, &c. I shall suspect I was not awake
" all the Time I was reading that Book :
" And I am as certain as one awake can
" be, that there are several Passages in
" that Book directly contrary to these
" Words. And there are some Expres-
" sions, in the *Vindication of the Reason-*
" *ableness*, &c. one would think, if Mr.
" *Edwards* had observ'd them, they would
" have prevented that Mistake."

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS
NOT.

Mr. *Bold*, p. 34. takes notice, that the
Creed-maker had not put the Query or
Objection right; which, he says, *Some,*
and not without some shew of Ground, may
be apt to start: And therefore Mr. *Bold*
puts the Query right, viz. " Why did
" Jesus Christ and his Apostles require
" Assent to, and Belief of this one Article
" alone, viz. That *Jesus is the Messiah,*
" to constitute and make a Man a Chri-
" stian, or true Member of Christ (as it
" is abundantly evident they did, from
" the *Reasonableness of Christianity*) if the
" Belief of more Articles is absolutely ne-
" cessary to make and constitute a Man
" a Christian?"

BUT

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS
NOT.

And therefore I put the *Objection* or
Query to him again, in Mr. *Bold's* Words,
and expect an Answer to it, *viz.*

LV. *Why did Jesus Christ and his Apostles require Assent to, and Belief of this one Article alone, viz. That Jesus is the Messiah, to make a Man a Christian (as it is abundantly evident they did, from all their Preaching recorded throughout the whole History of the Evangelists and the Acts) if the Belief of more Articles be absolutely necessary to make a Man a Christian?*

The Creed-maker having made believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, only one of the first and leading *Acts of Christian Faith*; Mr. *Bold*, p. 35. rightly tells him, That
“ Christian Faith must be the Belief of
“ something or other: And if it be the
“ Belief of any Thing besides this, That
“ *Jesus is the Christ or Messiah*, that other
“ Thing should be specified; and it should
“ be made appear, that the Belief that
“ *Jesus is the Messiah*, without the Belief
“ of that other Proposition, is not Chri-
“ stian Faith.”

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS
NOT.

Mr. B—d, in the four following Pages, 36—39. has excellently explained the Difference between that Faith which constitutes a Man a Christian, and that Faith whereby one that is a Christian believes the Doctrine taught by our Saviour; and the Ground of that Difference: And therein has fully overturned this Proposition, *That believing Jesus to be the Messiah, is but a Step, or the first Step to Christianity.*

BUT TO THIS Mr. Edwards ANSWERS NOT.

To the *Creed-maker's* supposing that other Matters of Faith were propos'd with this, That *Jesus* is the *Messiah*; Mr. *Bold* replies, That this should be prov'd, *viz.* That other Articles were propos'd, as requisite to be believed to make Men Christians. And p. 40. he gives a Reason why he is of another Mind, *viz.* "Because
" there is nothing but this recorded,
" which was insisted on for that Purpose."
" pose."

BUT TO THIS Mr. Edwards ANSWERS NOT.

Mr. *Bold*, p. 42. shews, that *Rom. x. 9.* which the *Creed-maker* brought against it, confirms the Assertion of the Author of the *Reasonableness*, &c. concerning the Faith that makes a Man a Christian.

BUT TO THIS Mr. Edwards ANSWERS NOT.

The

The Creed-maker says, p. 78. *This is the main Answer to the Objection* (or Query above propos'd) viz. *That Christianity was erected by Degrees.* This, Mr. *Bold*, p. 43. proves to be nothing to the Purpose, by this Reason; viz. "Because what makes
" one Man a Christian, or ever did make
" any Man a Christian, will at any Time,
" to the End of the World, make another
" Man a Christian:" And asks, "Will
" not that make a Christian now, which
" made the Apostles themselves Christians?"

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

In Answer to his sixth Chapter, Mr. *Bold*, p. 45. tells him, "It was not my Business
" to discourse of the Trinity, or any other
" particular Doctrine propos'd to be believ'd by them who are Christians; and
" that it is no fair and just Ground to accuse
" a Man for rejecting the Doctrines of the
" Trinity, and that Jesus is God, because
" he does not interpret some particular
" Texts to the same Purpose others do."

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

Indeed he takes notice of these Words of Mr. *Bold*, in this Paragraph, viz.
"Hence Mr. *Edwards* takes occasion to
" write many Pages about these Terms
" [viz. *Messiah, and Son of God*] But I do
" not

“ not perceive that he pretends to offer
 “ any Proof that these were not synony-
 “ mous Terms amongst the *Jews* at that
 “ Time; which is the Point he should
 “ have prov’d, if he design’d to invalidate
 “ what this Author says about that Matter.”

To this the *Creed-maker* replies, p. 257.
*The Animadverter doth not so much as offer
 one Syllable to disprove what I delivered,
 and closely urg’d on that Head. Answ.*
 What need any Answer to disprove, where
 there is no Proof brought that reaches the
 Proposition in question? If there had been
 any such Proof, the producing of it, in
 short, had been a more convincing Argu-
 ment to the Reader, than so much brag-
 ging of what has been done. For here are
 more Words spent (for I have not set them
 all down) than would have serv’d to have
 express’d the Proof of this Proposition,
viz. That the Terms above-mentioned
 were not synonymous amongst the *Jews*,
 if there had been any Proof of it. But
 having already examin’d what the *Creed-*
maker brags he has *closely urg’d*, I shall say
 no more of it here.

To the *Creed-maker*’s making me a *So-*
cinian, in his Eighth Chapter, for not na-
 ming Christ’s Satisfaction amongst the Ad-
 vantages and Benefits of Christ’s Coming
 into the World; Mr. *Bold* replies, “ 1. That
 “ it is no Proof, because I promised not
 “ to

“ to name every one of them. And the
“ Mention of some, is no Denial of others.”
2. He replies, That “ Satisfaction is not
“ so strictly to be termed an Advantage,
“ as the Effects and Fruits of it are ; and
“ that the Doctrine of Satisfaction in-
“ structs us in the Way how Christ did,
“ by divine Appointment, obtain those
“ Advantages for us.” And this was an
Answer that deserv’d some Reply from the
Creed-maker.

BUT TO THIS HE ANSWERS NOT.

Mr. *Bold* says right, that this is a Do-
ctrine that is of mighty Importance for a
Christian to be well acquainted with. And
I will add to it, that it is very hard for a
Christian, who reads the Scripture with
Attention, and an unprejudic’d Mind, to
deny the *Satisfaction of Christ* : But it be-
ing a Term not used by the Holy Ghost
in the Scripture, and very variously ex-
plain’d by those that do use it, and very
much stumbled at by those I was there
speaking to, who were such as I there say,
“ Who will not take a Blessing, unless
“ they be instructed what need they had
“ of it, and why it was bestowed upon
“ them ;” I left it, with the other dis-
puted Doctrines of Christianity, to be
look’d into (to see what it was Christ had
taught concerning it) by those who were
Christians, and believed Jesus to be the
Saviour

Saviour promised, and sent from God. And to those who yet doubted that he was so, and made this Objection, "What need
" was there of a Saviour?" I thought it most reasonable to offer such Particulars only as were agreed on by all Christians, and were capable of no Dispute, but must be acknowledg'd by every body to be needful. This, though the Words above quoted, out of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. p. 219. shew to be my *Design*; yet the *Creed-maker* plainly gives me the Lye, and tells me it was not my *Design*. All the World are *faithless, false, treacherous, hypocritical, Strainers upon their Reason and Conscience, Dissemblers, Journey-men, mercenary Hirelings*, except Mr. *Edwards*: I mean, all the World that opposes him. And must not one think he is mightily beholden to the Excellency and Readiness of his own Nature, who is no sooner engag'd in Controversy, but he immediately finds out in his Adversaries these Arts of Equivocation, Lying and Effrontery, in managing of it? Reason and Learning, and acquir'd Improvements, might else have let him gone on with others, in the dull and ordinary Way of fair arguing; wherein possibly he might have done no great Feats. Must not a rich fertile Soil within, and a prompt Genius, wherein a Man may readily spy the
Pro-

Propensities of base and corrupt Nature, be acknowledg'd to be an excellent Qualification for a Disputant, to help him to the quick Discovery and laying open of the Faults of his Opponents; which a Mind otherwise dispos'd, would not so much as suspect? Mr. *Bold*, without this, could not have been so soon found out to be a *Journeyman*, a *Dissembler*, an *hir'd Mercenary*, and stor'd with all those good Qualities, wherein he hath his full Share with me. But why would he then venture upon Mr. *Edwards*, who is so very quick-sighted in these Matters, and knows so well what villainous Man is capable of?

I should not here, in this my *Vindication*, have given the Reader so much of Mr. *Bold's* Reasoning, which though clear and strong, yet has more Beauty and Force as it stands in the whole Piece in his Book: Nor should I have so often repeated this Remark upon each Passage, *viz. To this Mr. Edwards answers not*; had it not been the shortest and properest Comment could be made on that triumphant Paragraph of his, which begins in the 128th Page of his *Socinian Creed*; wherein, among a great deal of no small strutting, are these Words: *By their profound Silence they acknowledge they have nothing to reply.* He that desires to see more of the same noble Strain, may have

have recourse to that eminent Place. Besides, it was fit the Reader should have this one Taste more of the *Creed-maker's* Genius, who passing by in Silence all these clear and apposite Replies of Mr. Bold, loudly complains of him, p. 259. *That where he [Mr. Bold] finds something that he dares not object against, he shifts it off.* And again, p. 260. *That he doth not make any Offer at Reason; there is not the least Shadow of an Argument.—As if he were only hir'd to say something against me [the Creed-maker] though not at all to the Purpose: And truly any Man may discern a MERCENARY Stroke all along; with a great deal more to the same Purpose.* For such Language as this, mix'd with Scurrility, neither fit to be spoken by, nor of a Minister of the Gospel, makes up the Remainder of his *Postscript*. But to prevent this for the future, I demand of him, That if in either of his Treatises there be any thing against what I have said in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, which he thinks not fully answer'd, he will set down the Proposition in direct Words, and note the Page of his Book where it is to be found; and I promise him an Answer to it. For as for his Railing, and other Stuff, besides the Matter, I shall hereafter no more trouble my self to take notice of it. And so much for Mr. Edwards.

THERE



THERE is another Gentleman, and of another Sort of Make, Parts, and Breeding, who (as it seems, ashamed of Mr. *Edward's* Way of handling Controversies in Religion) has had something to say of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. and so has made it necessary for me to say a Word to him, before I let these Papers go out of my Hand. It is the Author of the *Occasional Paper*, Numb. 1. The second, third, and fourth Pages of that *Paper*, gave me great Hopes to meet with a Man who would examine all the Mistakes which come abroad in Print, with that Temper and Indifferency, that might set an exact Pattern for Controversy, to those who would approve themselves to be sincere Contenders for Truth and Knowledge, and nothing else, in the Disputes they engag'd in. Making him Allowance for the Mistakes that Self-Indulgence is apt to impose upon human Frailty, I am apt to believe he thought his Performance had been such: But I crave Leave to observe, that good and candid Men are often misled, from a fair unbiass'd Pursuit of Truth, by an over-great Zeal for something that they,

upon wrong Grounds, take to be so; and that it is not so easy to be a fair and unprejudic'd Champion for Truth, as some who profess it think it to be. To acquaint him with the Occasion of this Remark, I must desire him to read and consider his nineteenth Page; and then to tell me,

I. Whether he knows that the *Doctrine* propos'd in the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. was borrow'd, as he says, from *Hobbes's Leviathan*? For, I tell him, I borrow'd it only from the Writers of the *Four Gospels*, and the *Acts*; and did not know that those Words he quoted out of the *Leviathan* were there, or any thing like them. Nor do I know yet any farther, than as I believe them to be there, from his Quotation.

II. Whether affirming, as he does positively this, which he could not know to be true, and is in it self perfectly false, were meant to increase or lessen the Credit of the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. in the Opinion of the World? Or is it consonant with his own Rule, *p. 3. of putting candid Constructions on what Adversaries say*? Or with what follows, in these Words? *The more divine*
the

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 385
the Cause is, still the greater should be the Caution. The very discoursing about Almighty God, or our holy Religion, should compose our Passions, and inspire us with Candor and Love. It is very indecent to handle such Subjects in a manner that betrays Rancor and Spite. These are Fiends that ought to vanish, and should never mix either with a Search after Truth, or the Defence of Religion.

III. Whether the Propositions which he has, out of my Book, inserted into his nineteenth Page, and says *are consonant to the Words of the Leviathan*, were those, of all my Book, which were likeliest to give the Reader a true and fair Notion of the Doctrine contained in it? If they were not, I must desire him to remember and beware of his *Fiends*. Not but that he will find those Propositions there to be true. But that neither he nor others may mistake my Book, this is that, in short, which it says:

1. That there is a Faith that makes Men Christians.

2. That this Faith is the believing *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the *Messiah*.

C c

3. That

3. That the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King, promis'd and sent from God: And so lays upon all his Subjects an absolute and indispensable Necessity of assenting to all that they can attain the Knowledge that he taught; and of a sincere Obedience to all that he commanded.

This, whether it be the Doctrine of the *Leviathan*, I know not. This appears to me out of the *New Testament*, from whence (as I told him in the *Preface*) I took it to be the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles; and I would not willingly be mistaken in it. If therefore there be any other Faith besides this, absolutely requisite to make a Man a Christian, I shall here again desire this Gentleman to inform me what it is; *i. e.* to set down all those Propositions which are so indispensibly to be believed (for 'tis of simple Believing, I perceive, the Controversy runs) that no Man can be a *Believer*, *i. e.* a Christian, without an actual Knowledge of, and an explicit Assent to them. If he shall do this with that Candor and Fairness he declares to be necessary in such Matters, I shall own my
2
self

self obliged to him: For I am in earnest, and I would not be mistaken in it.

If he shall decline it, I, and the World too, must conclude, that, upon a Review of my Doctrine, he is convinced of the Truth of it, and is satisfied that I am in the right. For it is impossible to think that a Man of that Fairness and Candor, which he solemnly prefaces his Discourse with, should continue to condemn the Account I have given, of the Faith which I am persuaded makes a Christian; and yet he himself will not tell me (when I earnestly demand it of him, as desirous to be rid of my Error, if it be one) what is that more, which is absolutely required to be believed by every one, before he can be a Believer; *i. e.* what is indispensibly necessary to be known, and explicitly believed, to make a Man a Christian.

Another Thing which I must desire this Author to examine by those his own Rules, is what he says of me, *p.* 30. where he makes me to have a Prejudice against the Ministers of the Gospel, and their Office, from what I have said, in my *Reasonableness*, &c. *p.* 221, 222. concerning the *Priests* of the World in our Saviour's Time; which he calls *bitter Reflections*.

If he will tell me what is so *bitter*, in any one of those Passages which he has set down, that is not true, or ought not to be said there, and give me the Reason why he is offended at it; I promise him to make what Reparation he shall think fit, to the Memory of those *Priests* whom he with so much Good Nature patronizes, near Seventeen Hundred Years after they had been out of the World; and is so tenderly concerned for their Reputation, that he excepts against that, as said against them, which was not. For one of the three Places he sets down, was not spoken of Priests. But his making my mentioning the Faults of the Priests of old, in our Saviour's Time, to be an *Exposing the Office of the Ministers of the Gospel* now, and a *Vilifying those who are employed in it*; I must desire him to examine, by his own Rules of Love and Candor, and to tell me, Whether I have not reason here again to mind him of his *FIENDS*, and to advise him to beware of them? And to shew him why I think I have, I crave Leave to ask him these Questions:

I. Whether I do not all along plainly, and in express Words, speak of the Priests of the World preceding, and in our Saviour's

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 389
viour's Time? Nor can my Argument
bear any other Sense.

II. Whether all I have said of them be
not true?

III. Whether the representing truly the
Carriage of the *Jewish*, and more espe-
cially of the *Heathen* Priests in our Sa-
viour's Time, as my Argument requir'd,
can expose the Office of the Ministers of
the Gospel now? or ought to have such
an Interpretation put upon it?

IV. Whether what he says of the *Air
and Language I use reaching farther*, carry
any thing else in it but a Declaration,
that he thinks some Mens Carriage now
hath some Affinity with that I have truly
said of the Priests of the World before
Christianity; and that therefore the
Faults of those should have been let
alone, or touch'd more gently, for fear
some should think these now concerned
in it?

V. Whether, in Truth, this be not to
accuse them with a Design to draw the
Envy of it on me? Whether out of Good
Will to them, or to me, or both, let him
look. This I am sure, I have spoke of
none

none but the Priests before Christianity, both *Jewish* and *Heathen*. And for those of the *Jews*, what our Saviour hath pronounced of them, justifies my *Reflections* from being *bitter*; and that the idolatrous Heathen Priests were better than they, I believe our Author will not say: And if he were preaching against them, as opposing the Ministers of the Gospel, I suppose he would give as ill a Character of them. But if any one extends my Words farther than to those they were spoke of, I ask whether that agrees with his Rules of *Love and Candor*?

I shall impatiently expect, from this Author of the *Occasional Paper*, an Answer to these Questions; and hope to find them such as becomes that Temper, and Love of Truth, which he professes. I long to meet with a Man, who laying aside Party, and Interest, and Prejudice, appears in Controversy so as to make good the Character of a Champion of Truth for Truth's sake; a Character not so hard to be known whom it belongs to, as to be deserv'd. Whoever is truly such an one, his Opposition to me will be an Obligation. For he that proposes to himself the convincing me of an Error, only for Truth's sake, cannot, I know, mix any
Rancor,

Reasonableness of CHRISTIANITY. 391

Rancor, or *Spite*, or *Ill-will*, with it. He will keep himself at a distance from those *Fiends*, and be as ready to hear, as offer Reason. And two so disposed, can hardly miss Truth between them, in a fair Enquiry after it: At least, they will not lose Good-breeding, and especially Charity; a Virtue much more necessary than the attaining of the Knowledge of obscure Truths, that are not easy to be found, and probably therefore not necessary to be known.

The unbiass'd Design of the Writer, purely to defend and propagate Truth, seems to me to be that alone which legitimates Controversies. I am sure it plainly distinguishes such from all others, in their Success and Usefulness. If a Man, as a sincere Friend to the Person, and to the Truth, labours to bring another out of Error, there can be nothing more beautiful, nor more beneficial. If Party, Passion, or Vanity direct his Pen, and have a hand in the Controversy, there can be nothing more unbecoming, more prejudicial, nor more odious. What Thoughts I shall have of a Man that shall, as a Christian, go about to inform me what is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, I have declar'd, in the *Preface* to my *Reasonableness of*
Chri-

Christianity, &c. Nor do I find my self yet alter'd. He that in Print finds fault with my imperfect Discovery of that wherein the Faith which makes a Man a Christian consists, and will not tell me what more is required, will do well to satisfy the World what they ought to think of him.

F I N I S.



